




# Imprimatur,

*April 5.*  
*1677.*

*Guil. Jane R. P. D.*  
*Hen. Epif. Lond.*  
*à facris domesticis.*








# Imprimatur,

*April 5.*  
*1677.*

*Guil. Jane R. P. D.*  
*Hen. Epif. Lond.*  
*à facris domesticis.*



AN  
EXPLICATION  
OF THE  
CATECHISM  
OF THE  
Church of England.

PART I.

Containing an EXPLICATION of the Preliminary  
QUESTIONS and ANSWERS of it,

And of the

APOSTLES CREED.

Together with

An INTRODUCTION to the Whole

In a Discourse concerning

CATECHIZING

AND THE

Catechism of the Church of ENGLAND.

By *Gabriel Towerfon*, sometime Fellow of *All-Soules Colledge* in *Oxford*, and  
now Rector of *Wellwynne* in *Hartford-shire*.

Cyrrill. in *Præfat. Catechef.* pag. 10.

Παράμεινε ταῖς κατηχήσεσιν, εἰ καὶ πολλὰ παρατίθωμεν λίγοντες, μή ποτε ἡ διάνοιά σου ἐκλυθῇ.  
Ὅσα γὰρ λαμβάνεις κατὰ ἀντικειμένης ἐνεργείας, ὅσα λαμβάνεις κατὰ ἀρεσιῶν, κατὰ  
Ἰουδαίων, καὶ Σαμαρειτῶν, καὶ ἑθνῶν. Πολλὰς ἰσχυρὺς ἔχεις, πολλὰ βέλη λάμβαναι.

L O N D O N,

Printed by *J. M.* for *John Martyn* at the *Bell* in  
*St Paul's Church-yard.* MDC LXXVIII.

AN

OF THE

CHURCH

OF THE

COMING OF THE KING OF GLORY

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

AND

ALSO

THE

AN UNCOMMON SENSE

OF THE

CHURCH

AND THE

CHURCH OF THE CHURCH

THE CHURCH OF THE CHURCH

THE CHURCH OF THE CHURCH

THE CHURCH OF THE CHURCH

THE CHURCH OF THE CHURCH

THE CHURCH OF THE CHURCH

THE CHURCH OF THE CHURCH

THE CHURCH OF THE CHURCH

TO  
The Right Reverend *FATHER* in God

**H E N R Y**

Lord Bishop of *L O N D O N*,

AND

One of His Majesties most Honourable  
Privy-Council, &c.

*My Lord,*



*H E Cause of the Church of England hath been always so dear unto Your Lordship, and it is now so much your care and interest to maintain it, that I cannot but think you will cast a favourable eye upon the endeavours of any, how mean soever, which may tend to the promoting of it.*

*I heartily wish that what I now offer towards it, might be as favourably listen'd to by other men, or at least allowed that equitable consideration which the merits of the Cause require. For so I doubt not they would find, even by these weak Essays of mine, that much more may be said in the behalf of the Church of England, than they, who are the greatest enemies thereof, will find it easie to take off. And possibly had the Religion thereof been heretofore more attentively considered, or but impartially compar'd with that of other Churches, there would not only have been no need at present of these or such like endeavours, but that bu-*  
*A* *mour,*



## The Epistle Dedicatory.

*mour, which hath been observ'd to prevail in the English, of valuing the supposed advantages of their neighbours above those of their native Country, would have had no influence at all upon their Faith; and whatever they might have thought of either the garb or the commodities of other Nations, yet no Religion would have been so much esteemed by them as their own.*

*It is not my purpose (neither would it, it may be, be now to any) to call those, who have departed from us, to enter into that Comparison; But if either Rome or Geneva hath not so taken possession of their affections, as to hinder them from looking at all back toward that Church from which they have departed, I should not despair of shewing them so much loveliness in her Religion, as might at least induce them to forbear the destruction of it, till either the one or the other of them were better assur'd of the establishing of their own: Lest happily, whilst their thoughts are taken up with removing our Church out of the way, they only make way for somewhat else which may be much more inconsistent with those Professions they are willing to advance. For if the Church of England may not yet be thought to be sufficiently reformed, how will those, who have that opinion of her, be able to brook the Authority of that, which is so far from reforming errors, that she will not allow her self capable of any? And if, on the other side, she be thought to have par'd off too much of the ancient manners, how ill will they, who think so, be able to digest such a Religion as will not allow even of those things, which must be acknowledged to have prevail'd in the first and purest Ages of the Church?*

*What influence such thoughts as these may have upon the parties concern'd I am not able to say; neither*  
*will*

## The Epistle Dedicatory.

will I be over curious to divine. But because it is not impossible they may some time or other meet with a favourable reception (and God grant it may be early enough to prevent their ruine and our own) and because, however it may succeed with them, what I have formed in my mind may be of some use to keep those in the Communion of the Church who have not as yet departed from it; I have resolved with my self to expose to publick view an account of that Religion which our Church professeth to maintain, and which so many endeavours are us'd on all hands to destroy. In order whereunto, because I could not meet with any other monument thereof which is more comprehensive than the Catechism, I have modelled my meditations by it, and am only sorry that that and the Church hath not met with some other, who might have given more light and a surer establishment to them.

I have indeed lain under one notable disadvantage as to this first part of my endeavours, because forced to write after \*one of Your Lordships own Order, and whose learned Labours upon the Creed may seem to have left no room even for the diligence of those who are of the same great Abilities with himself. For which cause it was once in my thoughts to have laid aside that Argument, and contented my self with those he had left untouched. But beside that if I had so done, I must have fallen short of my design, which was to give an entire Explication of the Catechism of the Church of England, it was not difficult for me to discern that the Creed is too copious a subject for any one man's diligence to exhaust. Instead therefore of quitting so material a part of that Argument which I had undertaken, I set my self to the handling of it, avoiding only, as much as might be, the meddling with those things

A 2

which

\*L. B. of  
Coester.



---

## The Epistle Dedicatory.

---

*which his more able pen had prevented me in.*

*Such as it is I have taken the boldness to dedicate it to Your Lordship, and I do it so much the more cheerfully, because Your Lordship hath a perfect understanding of that Faith which I maintain, and both will and courage enough to defend it. Though had I no other reasons for this address, That countenance you have been pleas'd to afford unto my self, and the far greater obligation you have laid upon the whole body of the Clergy by entring your self into it, would have easily perswaded me to it: There being some hopes that men will in time be brought to a due veneration of that Profession which they see not to be refus'd by one who is so honourably descended. Which as it is therefore but fit for us to acknowledge who have no such advantages to redeem our selves from contempt by, so I think my self happy that I have this opportunity of declaring my own grateful sense of it, as well as my being,*

**My Lord,**

**Your Lordships most humble.**

**and most obedient Servant,**

**GABRIEL TOWERSON.**

---

AN  
INTRODUCTION  
TO THE  
WHOLE  
IN A  
DISCOURSE  
CONCERNING  
CATECHIZING  
AND THE  
CATECHISM  
OF THE  
Church of England,

**T**HAT a work of this nature may not make its entrance into the world without giving some general account of that *Catechism* which it professeth to explain, and of that *Institution* which gave occasion to this and other the like compositions, I intend to premise something concerning Catechizing, *What it is, and of what Antiquity in the Church; What order was anciently observ'd about it and those who were the subjects of it, and to whom this office was delegated; What appearance there is in Antiquity of the Catechizing of those who were baptized in their Infancy, of what necessity and advantage the thus instructing of them is, together with the means whereby it may be most successfully perform'd: Subjoining thereto, so far as I shall be able to discover it, the process of our own Catechism, what was done in the Church of England by way of preparation to it, by whom and when it was at first compil'd, what addition was made to it in after-times, and what there is in it so compleated to recommend it to the world.*

## An Introduction concerning Catechizing,

<sup>a</sup> Κατηχίζου,  
παιδαγωγ. ἐν-  
χίζου. Hefych.

Now to *Catechize*, if we have a regard to the *Etymology* of the word, is nothing else than to *instruct by sounds*<sup>a</sup>, and particularly by those *Articulate* ones which the mouths of our instructors form. A way of instruction, which in ancient times did mostly prevail; whether it were that they, whose office it was, thought by this means to preserve their learning from becoming too common, and those therefore, who were willing to learn of them, in the greater dependance upon themselves; or whether it were (which I doubt not was one especial cause of it) that *letters* were not then generally known, and they therefore under a necessity of communicating their instructions that way, if they intended to benefit the world. For thus it appears that the *Druids* among us were wont to instruct their Scholars, the *Ancient Theologues* among the *Egyptians* theirs, and (which is more home to our purpose) thus, as I shall afterwards shew, the *Ancient Christians* were wont to instruct those who were willing to become Proselytes to their Religion; And may not improbably be thought to be the reason of their making use of the word *Catechize* to represent that sort of instruction to the world.

<sup>b</sup> See Explic. of  
the Preliminary  
Quest. and An-  
swers of the Ca-  
tech.

In the *sense of the Church*, to which for a long time that word hath been in a manner peculiar, to *Catechize* is to give men a general knowledge of those things in the Christian Religion which are of necessity to be known, whether as to their participation of *Baptism*, which is the farthest the Ancients Catechisms went where they had the heathen for their Disciples, or the fitting them to partake of the highest mystery of our Religion, even the *Supper of our Lord*, and to which the Catechizing of those that are Baptiz'd in their Infancy doth more especially tend. Only as they who were to be instructed in order to their Baptism, were also to be fitted for it by such *holy resolutions* as Baptism<sup>b</sup> of it self involves; So to Catechize did therefore import also not only the giving them a general knowledge of what a Christian is to do, but the proving them also with what intentions they apply'd themselves to the Christian Faith, and what likelihood there was of their continuing in the obedience of it after they should be baptiz'd into it. Which is so clear from St. *Augustine's* Book *de Catechizandis rudibus*, and the many *Canons of Councils* concerning the either framing or reforming of the *Catechumens* manners, that it will be superfluous to insist upon it.

<sup>c</sup> Act. 21. 24.

<sup>d</sup> Rom. 2. 18.

<sup>e</sup> 1 Cor. 14. 19.

No doubt being to be made what *Catechizing* is, and particularly that *Catechizing* which is antecedent to Baptism, which is first of all to be entertained of; It will be but time to enquire of what *Antiquity* it is in the Church: Which I shall not doubt to affirm to be of the same with Christianity it self, and those memorials which the Scripture hath given us of it. For neither is the Scripture (however made less clear by our Translation of it) a stranger to the name or thing, to this preparatory instruction, or that title which it bears. Not that I think the word *Catechize* is always to be taken in the present notion (for sometimes it is us'd for any *information*<sup>c</sup> concerning mens behaviour, and at others for a more clear and perfect erudition<sup>d</sup>, yea that which may seem to have been intended for the *edifying*<sup>e</sup> of the Church, for which cause it is not unlikely that *Hefychius* render'd the word *κατηχίζου* by *ἐκδοκίμω*) but that the word *Catechize* is sometimes signally us'd in that sense whereof we speak, and



## and the Catechism of the Church of England.

so a proof both of the thing intended, and of that name which it usually bears. I appeal for the proof hereof to the preamble of St. *Luke's* Gospel, and where he tells that *Theophilus* to whom he inscribes it, that as he himself had attain'd a perfect knowledge of all things from the beginning, so he would write to him in order, or rather from point to point concerning them, that so he might know the certainty of those things wherein he had been instructed or Catechized. For as the Catechizing whereof he here speaks is of necessity to be understood of an instruction in the Christian faith, so being oppos'd, as it is, to a more particular declaration of things, and propos'd to be completed by it, it must consequently be thought to import that more general and gross instruction, wherein we have said Catechizing properly so called to consist. Which notion is so much the more to be stood upon, because that Catechizing whereof we speak (as I shall afterwards shew from St. *Augustine*) had a more particular respect to our Saviour's birth, passion, resurrection and ascension which are the principal arguments of the Gospels. To that passage of St. *Luke's* Gospel subjoyn we another of the same Authour in his *Acts*<sup>f</sup>, and which will not only lend light to the former text, but be a farther proof of that Catechizing whereof we speak. For not only have we mention there of *Apollo's* being Catechized in the way of the Lord (for so the Greek hath it) but that Catechizing represented as antecedent to his Christian Baptism (for he is said to have known only or to have experimented *the Baptism of John*)<sup>g</sup> yea oppos'd to, and compleated by a more perfect instruction in the same way by the assistance of *Aquila* and *Priscilla*: Which shewes the Catechizing before spoken of to have been no other than that grosser instruction, which was to prepare men to Baptism, which is that we are endeavouring to demonstrate.

<sup>f</sup> Act. 18. 25,

26.

<sup>g</sup> Grot. Annot. in loc.

Now though out of these two texts hardly will any place be found, which doth by name assert that Catechizing whereof we speak, yet will it not be at all difficult to discern the thing it self which is that we are especially to intend. For such I account, and I think not without reason, several of the Sermons of the Apostles, particularly that Sermon of St. *Peter* to the unconverted Jews recorded in the *Acts*<sup>h</sup>, and whereby about three thousand souls are said to have been brought over to their religion. For as it appears that this Sermon of his was to prepare them for Baptism, and which accordingly upon their conviction thereby, they receiv'd; So the contents of it, which are the death, and resurrection, and ascension of our Saviour, and the time wherein it was spoken, shew what kind of instruction it was: It being impossible to believe, though we should allow that which St. *Luke* presents us with to be but an Abstract of what was spoken, that St. *Peter* should in so short a space give any other than a gross and general declaration of those things, which Christianity prompts men to believe. Only if it should be said (as I know it may be with some reason) that that part of St. *Peter's* Sermon, whereby his hearers were brought to a liking of Christianity, is rather to be look'd upon as preparatory to Catechizing, than Catechizing properly so call'd, as which supposeth the party that is under it to be already in a disposition to embrace it; It will not be difficult to make answer, that as that part of his Sermon had somewhat in it of Catechizing also, be-

cause

## An Introduction concerning Catechizing,

cause representing to the hearers some of the principal parts of Christian truth, so the latter part thereof must be look'd upon as much more so, even that which followed upon the hearers enquiring *Men and brethren what shall we do.* For here we find even these hearers expressing their desire of being instructed in it, and St. Peter accordingly directing them to that *repentance* and *faith* and *Baptism* whereby they were to be initiated into it. But of all the places of Scripture which mark out to us that form of Instruction, the Antiquity whereof we are now demonstrating, there seems to me to be none more pertinent, than this following one of the *Author to the Hebrews*<sup>1</sup>. *Therefore leaving the principles of, or initial doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection, not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith towards God, of the doctrine of Baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment.* For as here there is a manifest difference between the initial and fundamental doctrines of Christianity, and a more perfect institution in it; As moreover those initial and fundamental doctrines are apparently no other than what were wont to be instill'd into men to prepare them for Baptism, which is that form of instruction whereof we speak: So the doctrine of mens Baptisms, and of that Imposition of hands which followed upon it, having a place among those initial and fundamental ones, shewes evidently enough, that, the better to prepare men for the one and the other, they were thus generally instructed before they were admitted to either. I will not so far supererogate, as to subjoin to these testimonies out of Scripture the many proofs the writings of the *Ancients* and particularly the *Canons of Councils* afford us of the continuance of this instruction in the following Ages of the Church. For as no man, who hath any insight into affairs of this nature, can need any direction to them; so I shall have occasion to produce them, when I come to shew what order was anciently observed in it, and shall therefore forbear the mention of them here. Give me leave only, the better to smoothe my way to the consideration of that affair, to subjoin this one testimony out of *Justin Martyr*. For though that most Ancient *Father* do not expressly assert that Catechetical institution whereof we speak; Yet affirming, as he doth<sup>k</sup>, that *whosoever were perswaded that those things which were taught by them were true, and promised to live accordingly, were first of all taught to pray with fasting for the forgiveness of their sins* (the Christians also *fasting and praying with them*) *and then* and not till then *brought to be baptiz'd*, he plainly supposeth such an Institution to precede, and that they were both instructed in that religion into which they were to be baptiz'd, and directed to such means, as might capacitate them for those great advantages, which Baptism brings with it to the world.

<sup>1</sup> Heb. 6. 1, 2.

<sup>k</sup> Apolog. 2.  
pag. 93.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. 14. 23.

To go on now to shew what order was anciently observ'd about Catechizing, and those who were the Subjects of it; Where first of all we are to know, that as (unless it were, when the fear of persecution occasion'd the contrary) the places of the Christian Assemblies, or at least so far as the instructions there given, were open to those who were strangers to the Christian faith<sup>1</sup>, as well as to those who had given up their names to it; So it is easy to imagine that the holiness of their doctrine, and the power

## and the Catechism of the Church of England.

power of that Spirit by which it was influenced, might produce in some of them such a liking of it <sup>m</sup>, as to desire to become proselytes thereto. This therefore being signifi'd to those who had the oversight of the Church <sup>n</sup> enquiry was made by them into the past lives, or professions of those who thus offered themselves, that so if they had been of any perfectly unlawful ones, they might be both admonish'd of the sinfulness thereof, and make promise for the future not to continue any longer in such either professions or courses. Which promise being once obtain'd, they were admitted into the rank of Catechumens by *prayer* <sup>o</sup> and *imposition of hands*, and so pass'd over to those by whom they were more particularly to be instructed. Imagine we now the Catechumen thus made to be brought into the *School* or *private Auditory* of the Catechist (for that he did not exercise this Office in the Church, is clear from a passage <sup>p</sup> of *Eusebius*) where the first thing done by him was to enquire into the grounds of the Catechumen's thus offering himself to become a Christian <sup>q</sup>: Which enquiry was not only made of the party concern'd, but of those Christians, who both brought and recommended him, and who were a kind of Godfathers to him. If answer was made, that he did it to obtain that eternal life which Christianity promised, and it may be upon some extraordinary impulse of God upon his mind, (such as were not unusual in those elder days) the Catechist did then approve of this his resolution, and encourage him to persist in it, letting him know how much such a life was to be preferr'd to this temporary one, how splendid or well accommodated soever. If, by the Answer that was return'd, it did not so clearly appear, that the Catechumen was led by such motives, but rather by a desire of gratifying those upon whom he depended, or by any other such worldly consideration; He did not therefore reject him from his instructions, but after a gentle reproof of his ignorance, and the setting before him the ends men ought to propose to themselves in adjoining themselves to the Christian religion, raise up his mind to the desire of that happiness which Christianity was intended to bring men to. The way being thus plain'd to those instructions he was to instil, the Catechist did not then (as is now in use) present them with an abstract *in writing* of the principles of Christianity by way of *Question* and *Answer*, withal requiring of them an account of those Answers, and explaining those Answers to them; But (as appears by St. *Augustine's* Book *de rudibus Catechizandis*, and the Catechisms of St. *Cyril* yet extant) entertain them with a long *narration* or *discourse*, the Catechumens generally standing; though by St. *Augustine* advis'd to be changed into sitting to take off from the weariness of the hearers. The argument of that *narration* or *discourse* was the Story of the Bible in short from the creation of the world to the foundation of the Church; more particularly the giving an account from the *Old Testament* how Christianity was all along presignified, and from the *New*, what our Saviour was, how he was born, liv'd, and died, how he rose again, and ascended into Heaven. All which was clos'd with particular remarks concerning the *resurrection of the dead*, and the *future judgment*, as which were both the most important and most question'd Articles of our religion; with an admonition *moreover* to beware of false teachers whether within or without, but more especially, that they did not suffer themselves either to be

— 24, 25.

<sup>n</sup> *Constit. Apost.*  
li. 8. c. 38.

<sup>o</sup> *Vid. Vales.*  
*Annot. ad Euseb.*  
*de Vita Const.*  
li. 4. c. 61.

<sup>p</sup> *Vid. eund.*  
*Vales. in Not.*  
*ad Euseb. Eccl.*  
*Hist. li. 6. c. 19.*  
<sup>q</sup> *August. de*  
*rud. Catechi-*  
*zandis.*



## An Introduction concerning Catechizing,

be scandalized or corrupted by the evil lives of some Christians, as who our Saviour had foretold would not be wanting, and whom God would in fine call to a severe account for it. With these and such like discourses did the Catechist entertain his Scholars at their first approach to his instructions, but afterwards with more minute and particular ones; Taking for his argument some particular doctrine of faith, or (which was of no less esteem) some particular virtue, and pressing them to the practice of it: St. Ambrose in his Book *de iis qui mysteriis initiantur*, telling us in the very entrance of it, that all his moral discourses had for their end the instructing men in the way of virtue, that so they might be fitted for that Baptism which they were to receive, and for that piety of life which would then be more especially incumbent on them. For though St. Ambrose was no Catechist, nor those discourses of his therefore Catechetical lectures properly so call'd, yet they shew with what kind of discourses those Novices were to be entertain'd, and what therefore we are to believe they, to whom that Office did more peculiarly belong, were wont to make the Argument of theirs.

Now though that provision whereof we have been speaking was no doubt an excellent one, and by which the Church did approve it self an indulgent Mother to them, yet her care for them and for their welfare did not end here. For beside her admitting, or rather obliging them at the very first to be present in her Assemblies at the *Lessons* and the *Expositions* of them, whence it was that they had the name of the *Hearers*; After they had given proof of their more cordially intending that religion to which they pretended, they were also admitted to partake with her in those *prayers* which she put up to God in their behalf, and were call'd the *prayers of the Catechumens*. In fine, not contented thus to form their belief and devotion, such was her watchfulness over, and care for them, that, if they hapned to offend, she put them under penance, as several *Canons* in the *Code of the Universal Church*, and of the *Council of Illiberis* do sufficiently declare. Such order was anciently observed about Catechizing and those who were the subjects of it; till the time of that *state* (which was sometimes of two<sup>a</sup>, sometimes of more years continuance) was now expiring, and the persons who were under it had given up their *names* and *petitions* to be baptiz'd, which was sometime before *Easter*<sup>2</sup>, the then usual time of Baptism. After which, instead of remitting of the Church doubled her diligence, and intended yet more the institution and preparation of them: In order thereunto (as may appear from the Catechisms of St. *Cyrill*, which were made upon that occasion) exhorting them earnestly to that repentance and piety which became them, giving them a more clear and particular knowledge of that *faith* into which they were baptiz'd, and which therefore was then<sup>a</sup> given to them to be considered of and remembred by them; as in fine, agreeably to the season, which was always a time of fasting and praying, praying and fasting with them<sup>b</sup>, and for them. Which done and an account given by them to the *Bishop* or his *Presbyters* of that *faith* they had been so long a learning, the time of their *Catechumenate* expir'd, and they were therefore forthwith admitted to the participation of that Baptism, toward which they had been so long and so diligently travelling.

<sup>a</sup> Vid. Beuvr. Annot. in Conc. Niceni can. 14. & Conc. Neoc. can. 5.

<sup>1</sup> Beuvr. ibid.

<sup>a</sup> Can. 14--50. edit. Justell.  
<sup>b</sup> Can. 67, 68.

<sup>a</sup> Conc. Illib. can. 4--42.  
<sup>1</sup> Augustin. de Curâ pro mortuis cap. 12.  
<sup>2</sup> Cyrill. Pref. Catech.  
<sup>3</sup> Aug. ubi supra.

<sup>a</sup> Ambr. li. 5. Epist. 33.

<sup>b</sup> Just. Mar. Apol. 2. p. 93.  
<sup>c</sup> Cod. Eccl. univ. can. 150.

## and the Catechism of the Church of England.

I will dismiss that Catechizing which is the subject of my present enquiry, when I have endeavoured to inform my reader *to whom that Office was delegated*: I do not mean as to the private or occasional management thereof (for so it might be committed to the care of ordinary Christians, yea to that of Christian women<sup>d</sup> as to those of their own Sex, where the usual Officers of the Church could not have easy access to them, nor they to those) but as to the ordinary and publick management thereof, and where no necessity requir'd the Churches contenting it self with a more private and less solemn one. For however women in particular might be intrusted to the care of women, where the commerce of others with them might be more difficult, or more liable to be misinterpreted; yet it is plain from several Canons of the Council of *Illiberis*, that the Catechumens of that Sex, as well as of the other, were under the inspection and discipline of the Church, and therefore not unlikely also under the publick erudition of it, where there were not the like difficulties, or grounds for caution. Of which yet if any doubt be made, we have not only *Eusebius* for a witness who reckons one *Herais* among those women who were *Origen's* Scholars in his Catechetick School of *Alexandria*, but also the *Preliminary Catechism* of *St. Cyrill*; He there addressing both it and himself to the Catechumens of each Sex, and entitling them *Sons* and *Daughters* of one and the same Mother the Church. Of this more publick sort of Catechizing therefore it is that I mean to entreat, and enquire to whom the management thereof was committed. And here in the first place I shall not at all scruple to affirm, that the *Apostles* first, and after them their successors the *Bishops*, did, where they had opportunity, intend this office themselves. For neither can we well think otherwise, when we find it given them in charge<sup>f</sup> both to *teach and baptize all nations*, and much less when we find *St. Peter* g, after he had brought certain Jews to a readiness to embrace Christianity, directing them at their own instance to that *Repentance* and *Faith* and *Baptism*, whereby they were to be made partakers of it. But as it is easie to see that so great a burthen could not have been born by them, unless they had laid part of it upon other mens shoulders; So it is not difficult to conjecture from their quitting to others<sup>h</sup> that *Baptizing* which was equally impos'd upon them, that they quitted that Catechetical instruction also, which was to prepare men for it: It being generally enough for them (considering how many Churches they were to plant, and to oversee when they had done) to convince those Heathen to whom they preach'd of the divinity of that Religion which they published, and give them such a tast of it as might invite them to look farther into it. And possibly some of those that travelled with them, and whom they found the fittest for the discharge of that office were appointed for the doing of it; The following practice of the Church shewing, that this was not the peculiar business of any one sort of men, no nor yet of any of the body of the Clergy. For of *St. Cyprian* it is affirmed by himself<sup>i</sup> that he appointed one *Optatus* to be a *Doctor of the hearers* or Catechist, who was not yet so much as one of the Clergy; and by *St. Augustine*<sup>k</sup> of that *Deogratias*, to whom he gave rules for the Catechizing of the ignorant, that he was but a *Deacon* in that Church, where so many men were brought to be Catechiz'd. From whence

<sup>d</sup> Vid. Jusell.  
in not. ad Cod.  
Eccl. Un. can.  
193. item Gros.  
Annot. in Phi.  
4. 3.

<sup>e</sup> Euseb. Eccl.  
Hist. li. 6.  
cap. 4.

<sup>f</sup> Mat. 28. 19.  
<sup>g</sup> Act. 2. 38.

<sup>h</sup> I Cor. 1. 14.

<sup>i</sup> Cyp. Ep. 24.

<sup>k</sup> De rudib. Ca.  
tech.

## An Introduction concerning Catechizing,

whence as it will follow that the lowest of the Clergy, yea those who were not as yet of it, were, if they had abilities for it, preferr'd to the management thereof; So it is not at all to be wondered at, when we consider that this exercise was not wont to be performed in the Church but in some private School or Auditory. For so it might well enough fit those, who were not as yet of the Clergy, yea who by reason of their youth seem'd hardly capable of entring into it: It being affirmed of *Origen*<sup>1</sup> that he was but *eighteen* years of age, when he was by *Demetrius* Bishop of *Alexandria* made Catechist of that famous School there. Only as when the office of making Disciples was delegated to the *Apostles*, and to those who should succeed them in their charge, it was but requisite that they should so far interest themselves in it, as to provide for the due discharge of it; So those successors of the *Apostles* the *Bishops*, to satisfy that duty of theirs, did both appoint men to it (as is evident in the cases of *Optatus* and *Origen*) and afterwards either by themselves or their *Presbyters*<sup>m</sup> took an account of that faith in which the Catechumens had been instructed, before they were admitted to be baptiz'd. By which means the office of Catechizing reverted to them again, or rather (because the others were but of their appointment) they shew'd themselves Catechists all along.

<sup>1</sup> *Enf. Eccl. Hist. li. 6. c. 3.*

<sup>m</sup> *Cod. Eccl. Univ. Can. 150.*

From that Catechizing which was *antecedent* to *Baptism*, pass we to that which was *subsequent* to it, and so design'd to fit men also for the highest mystery of our Religion, even the Supper of our Lord. Where again, following the method before laid down, I will enquire first of all what appearance there is in *Antiquity* of it. A question the rather to be ask'd, because that Catechizing is the only one now in use; and because the many *Canons of Councils*, which concern this sort of instruction, do manifestly relate unto the other. And certainly, whether it be that I have little skill in the writings of the Ancients, or (which perhaps will be found to be equally true) that there are indeed no instances of the Churches catechizing those who were baptized in their infancy; There appear to me so little footsteps thereof in that *Antiquity* which is truly primitive, that I have sometime been almost tempted to believe there was no such thing. And thus far I still continue of the same mind, as to believe there was no such solemn and publick Catechizing of them, as there was of those adult persons which were converted either from *Judaism* or *Heathenism*. I continue farther to believe, for the silence there is in *Antiquity* of any other, that as the Church admitted infants to *Baptism* upon the stipulation of their Godfathers, so it left the Catechizing of them to be principally perform'd by them. But as I have so much both charity and respect for the Ancient Church, as to believe that it would both revise the Catechetical instruction of the Godfathers, and supply what was wanting in it, which is no contemptible part of Catechetical instruction; So I am farther confirm'd in that belief by the assurance we have of the *Baptizing of Infants* from the beginning, by the necessity there was of thus instructing them after they came to years of discretion, and some particular usances of the Church in the Catechizing of those that were baptiz'd at riper years, as well as her diligence in it. For supposing (as I now shall, because I reserve the proof of it to another<sup>n</sup> place) that Infants were baptiz'd from the beginning; and supposing

<sup>n</sup> *Explic. of the Doctrine of the Sacraments.*



## and the Catechism of the Church of England.

supposing farther (because I shall by and by prove it) that there was a necessity of thus instructing them; after they came to be of years of maturity; It will be but reasonable to believe, yea though we had no other proofs to assure us of it, that the truly Ancient and Apostolick Church would not fail to do it, so far at least as I have before describ'd: How much more then, when we shall be farther encouraged to it by some particular usances of the Church in the Catechizing of those who were baptiz'd at riper years, which accordingly I come now to declare?

Now there are *two usances* of that nature, which seem to me to persuade the Churches Catechizing in some measure those who were baptized in their infancy, to wit its Catechizing adult persons, even after Baptism, in the *higher mysteries* of their Religion, yea Catechizing them *in those very things*, wherein they should have been before instructed, *supposing them*, by reason of sickness, *to have been baptiz'd, before that instruction could have been finished*. For the understanding the former whereof (and together therewith the force it may be of to shew that which we are now upon, we are to know) that how careful soever the Church was in Catechizing adult persons in all those things that were prerequir'd to Baptism, yet was she as careful to conceal other things from them, and particularly that great mystery of the Lords Supper. Which is so true, that she would not so much as suffer them to be present at the celebration of it, as that too not only upon the account of their having no interest in it, but being ° no way fit to be acquainted with it: To insinuate such things as these into the minds of those who were not as yet initiated, being, in the language of St. *Ambrose* p, rather to *betray* than *discover* them. But as how careful soever the Church might be to conceal these things from those who were not as yet Baptiz'd, yet she neither did nor could warrantably conceal them from them afterwards, because by the force of their Christianity they were to partake of those mysteries, and therefore also, that they might do it rightly, to be preinstructed in them; So the Church did therefore set it self to instruct them in, yea furnished them with a minute knowledge of them: Witness that tract of St. *Ambrose* so often quoted †, which was written for that very purpose, but especially those *Catechisms* of St. *Cyrill*, which have the name of *Mystagogick*, and where he doth not only give them a more particular account of the rites of Baptism, and that Confirmation which followed upon it, than they had it seems been acquainted with, but in the *third* and *fourth* of those Catechisms instruct them in the *Sacrament of the Lords Supper*, and in the reason of that *Service* which was performed at it. Which being appli'd to the Catechizing whereof we speak will easily evince the Churches practice of it. For well may we suppose her to have been solicitous for the due instruction of those who never yet came under her examination (especially before she admitted them to the participation of the chiefest mysteries) when we find her to have been so careful in building up those in the Christian Faith, whom she had before furnished with no contemptible knowledge of it. Of no less, if not more, force, is that other *usance* before remembered, and which was either renewed, or begun by the Council of *Laodicea*; by the *fourteenth Canon* of which it was provided, that if a person by reason of sickness was baptiz'd before he had been thoroughly instructed, he should,

° Dionys. Areop.  
Ecccl. Hierarch.  
cap. 3.  
† De iis qui mysteriis initiantur.

† De iis qui mysteriis initiantur.

## An Introduction concerning Catechizing,

if he recovered from it, be instructed in that Faith wherein he had not been thoroughly Catechized before: There being but reason to believe, because the case is the same in both, that the Church would think it as necessary to Catechize those Baptized children, who by reason of their Infancy were not capable of any preinstruction, as to Catechize those adult but also Baptized ones, who could not before receive a perfect one. But as other proofs of this sort of Catechizing in the *first ages* of the Church I cannot either find, or learn, what diligence soever I have employed in it; so for *later* ones the care of the Church was not such in other things, as to encourage us to enquire much into its practice in this affair. For when the Scriptures and the publick service came to be lock'd up in an unknown tongue, even from those, who might with more reason be allowed to look into them; What great likelihood can there be of the Churches instructing those in the principles of Christianity, who were less disposed to receive them? Only as it is not to be thought that the neglect was in all places alike, so we may find in our own *English Church* no very late proofs of the practice of it, at least so far as the *Creed*, and the *Lords Prayer*, which were upon the matter the only things then taught.

\* *Spelman. Concil. pag. 242.*  
 † *Can. 10.*

In a Synod that was held at *Cloveshow* or *Clyff* under *Cuthbert* Archbishop of *Canterbury* in the year 747, I find it ordain'd among other things, that those Priests, who did not as yet understand the *Creed* and the *Lords Prayer*, should both *learn them themselves* and *teach them to others in the English tongue*; Which though it be a lamentable proof of the ignorance of that Age, yet it is to be hop'd it produc'd some good effect upon those that needed it, and particularly upon those of the younger sort. However it were, it doth appear that in *after-times* the concerns of the younger sort came more particularly to be considered, and the instruction of them to be look'd upon as a thing, which the Church thought it self concerned to intend. For by the *Canons* given under King *Edgar* and which are reckoned to be about the year 967, there is not only care taken \* that Children should be taught their *Pater noster* and *Credo* by their Parents, but declaration also made † that every one should learn them, before they should be allowed, when dead, to be buried in consecrated ground, or thought worthy to receive the *Eucharist*; he being not worthy (as that Canon goes on) of the name of a Christian man, who will not learn these things, nor empowered to undertake for any either at the *Font*, or *Confirmation*, who doth not first thoroughly understand them. From whence as it doth appear, what opinion the Church then had of the necessity of this sort of Catechetical instruction, so it may well be presum'd, that agreeably to her own *Canon*, she made enquiry into the abilities of the younger sort, before she admitted them to the participation of the *Lords Supper*, or allowed them to be Sponsors for others. Agreeable hereto are those Ecclesiastical Laws of King *Knut* ‡, which are referred to the year 1032. the learning of the *Lords Prayer* and the *Creed* being enjoind by one of them † under the same penalties, and almost in the same words. Thus it was in the years before referred to, and not unlikely also in the succeeding ones, though to be sure more or less, as the Governours of the Church were careful in the discharge of their office, or negligent in the performance of

\* *Spelman. Concil. pag. 447.*  
 † *Can. 17.*  
 ‡ *Can. 22.*

† *Spelman. Concil. pag. 538.*  
 ‡ *Leg. 22.*

---

## and the Catechism of the Church of England.

---

of it. For in those days which immediately preceded the Reformation, there was it seems a necessity of an *injunction* from *Henry the eighth* that the Curates should teach the people to say in the English tongue the *Lords Prayer*, the *Creed*, and the *Commandments*; which last was then first represented in the number of those things, which were to be look'd upon as Fundamentals of Christian Doctrine.

*Heylin's Hist.  
of Reform. pag.  
20. of the Hist.  
of Edw. 6<sup>th</sup>.*

But because what hath been said concerning the Antiquity of this sort of Catechizing is rather built upon presumptions, than any express testimonies of Ancient Authors, or at least of those of the first Ages; And because one of those presumptions is the *necessity* there is, and always was, of the thus instructing those who were baptized in their infancy; Therefore to recommend it yet more to the approbation and practice of the world, I will now set my self to the establishing of it, though I would to God I could as easily perswade the practice of it, as shew the necessity thereof. For there are two things which perswade or rather enforce the thus instructing those, who by reason of their infancy were not capable of it before they were baptiz'd; the difference there is between their more mature and infant estate, and the obligation that lies upon them from what they promised in their infancy by those who brought them to be baptiz'd. For as though Christianity receive us in our infancy to a participation of its privileges upon the sole profession we make by those that bring us, yet it is upon the account of our incapacity to make a more immediate and personal one; So that incapacity being remov'd by our more mature estate, it is but reason to think it requires the taking of it upon our selves, and so much the rather because it requires an actual faith and repentance of all who are in a capacity to give it, even before it admits them to Baptism. That those therefore, who are now come to years of understanding, may so believe and repent, it is but necessary they should be first instructed in the nature of them both, and particularly by that Church to which God hath committed the care of Souls, and which hath already receiv'd these as members of her Society. Otherwise her latter behaviour will ill answer her former one; and she shall be in the number of those Mothers which give a being to their Children, but take no care to nourish them when they have done. Of not unlike force is that obligation which lies upon the parties baptiz'd from what they promised in their infancy by those that brought them to it. For Baptism being by the institution of God the *stipulation of a good conscience* towards him, and of that both Faith and Piety which constitutes it; Inducing moreover *as such* an obligation to the performance of it, agreeably to that ability which God shall give us for it; It will both infer upon the Baptized parties a necessity of so believing and living, as soon as they come to be in a capacity for it, and of the Churches taking care that they be instructed in it. For how shall either they so believe, or live, who know not what Christianity requires of them? or the Church think her self discharg'd, if she do not contribute what in her lies to a due information of them? Because over and above the care she ought to have of her respective children; it is by her means that these come to be oblig'd, and she therefore no way excusable, if she do not admonish them of that obligation, and shew them how it may be discharg'd. I may not omit to add the necessity there is of the same Cate-



---

## *An Introduction concerning Catechizing,*

---

chetical instruction upon the account of that Sacrament of the Lords Supper to which they are to be admitted, and of those higher both instructions and precepts which they are to be built up in. For neither the one nor the other being to be understood, or compli'd with, without a foregoing knowledge of those principles upon which they are built; It cannot but be thought the duty of that Church, which is intrusted with the dispensing of those mysteries, to give them a due knowledge of the other, and of those, who are to be admitted by her, to submit themselves unto it.

Now though after I have thus shewn the necessity of Catechizing, I may seem thereby to have said enough to prompt men to it (what is necessary to be done admitting of no other deliberation, than how it may be most successfully perform'd) yet to set the better edge upon the diligence both of the Catechist and his Scholars, I will also represent the *advantages* thereof, whether as they concern this sort of instruction in the general, or whether as they concern the thus training up the Catechumen betimes, and as soon as he becomes capable of it. If we consider this sort of instruction in the general, so it hath this visible advantage attending it, that it would in a great measure secure the person, who receiv'd it, from being drawn aside by the erroneous doctrines of evil men, and the Church from that trouble which ariseth by their separation; Those principles, which it instils, being, where duly imbib'd, no contemptible defensive against (that I say not also a confutation of) them. Not perhaps that they would of *themselves* procure such a security to all (for all men are not able to employ the most substantial principles to the best advantage) but that they would procure such a security with a little assistance from their teachers, and whom, for those principles sake, which they had learn'd from them, they would be more willing to listen to. Whereas, when men are expos'd to the wide world without any *prenotion* of them, no wonder if they become a prey to any man who shall endeavour to deceive them, especially if he also put on the guise of a pious one, and a true lover of their Souls. For beside the reverence men are apt to have for such a person, and by which they are dispos'd to an easie belief of what he affirms; they themselves have nothing to fence themselves against him; and may therefore be easily taken as a place that hath no rampart to protect it from the enemy, nor any powder and shot to annoy him. And whether the large spreading of heresies in the late licentious times be not owing in a great measure to the want of this instruction then, I shall leave to those to consider, who, by their immoderate inculcating of preaching, left neither room nor credit for the other. Sure I am when the generality of people began to fall off from them, as they themselves had before done from the Church of *England*, then Catechizing, though too late, became the argument of their discourses and books, and that venerable rite of Confirmation was willing to be receiv'd again, provided it might be performed by a Priest.

Supposing now as I think I may, that Catechizing is not without its advantage about whomsoever employ'd; it will not be difficult to shew, that it is much more advantageous when employ'd about children, as soon as they become capable of it. Because such are more apt to receive what

## and the Catechism of the Church of England.

what is instill'd into them, and more likely to retain what they have receiv'd. It is not unknown to those who have look'd into *Aristotle* <sup>b</sup>, *Nicomach. lib.* <sup>1. c. 3.</sup> or into any of those who have commented upon him, that young persons are represented by him as no fit Auditors of Moral Philosophy because of the violence of their passions. It is not my purpose, because I need not, to enter into that dispute, though certainly they who so much need it, as those, whose passions are exorbitant, do, should not be debarr'd the attending to it. But I will so far comply with him that excluded them, as to admonish rather to begin with them when they are yet but children, and before any of that exorbitancy doth appear. For then they are more apt to receive what is instill'd into them than they are in a more mature estate; they have no such prejudices upon their minds to hinder the reception of them, nor any such corrupt affections to prompt them to oppose them. Their minds are then truly, what they are commonly said to be, *rasa tabula*, a fair unwritten paper, but therefore the more susceptible of any impression. We see proofs enough of it in their easily learning of that which is evil, and more than is for the credit of their instructors. If we do not see the like in good, it is for the most part because we do not take care to instill it, and so secure them to Religion and to God. And though I cannot say (because of that corruption which is traduced to them) that there is as much of towardliness in their affections, as there is of unprejudicateness upon their minds; yet they are then free from any acquired corruptions there, and so not a little dispos'd to the receiving of such truths, as may contribute to the due seasoning of them. For having not as yet been acquainted with the vanities of the world, they can have nothing but *pure* or rather *impure* nature to thrust them on toward them, and their reason for that cause more ready to assent to those things, which tend to the depreting thereof. So apt are the minds of children to receive what is instill'd into them, yea such things as in their riper age they would not be forward to listen to; And that they will be as likely to retain what they have so imbib'd, we have the voice of Scripture and reason to assure us. For beside what we learn from *Solomon* <sup>c</sup> that if we *train up a child in the way wherein he should go, he will not, even when he is old, depart from it*; The reverence which children bear to their instructors, and the unwillingness that is in all persons to think themselves to have been deceiv'd, is such, that it is not an easie matter to take them off from those their first loves, how unworthy soever of their embraces: Witness mens generally continuing in that Religion wherewith they have been first imbued, whatever conviction is offered to take them off from it. And though perhaps there be not much of *vertue* in the first essays of children toward the replenishing of their minds with good and useful notions; though for that reason therefore there is no great expectation of the divine blessing on them, or appearance of advantage to that Catechetical instruction which prompts them to them; Yet as it must be look'd upon as a vertue in their either Parents or Governours to dispose them to Faith and Piety, so Vertue and Vice are things so much considered by God, that (if we may believe the Scriptures) the very *rudiments* thereof in children are not oftentimes without their reward or punishment. For thus we find God sometime to have sent *two she-bears* <sup>d</sup> to devour those <sup>e</sup> *2 King. 2. 23,* children, which gave *Elisha* the title of *Bald-head*; which if it were a vice, <sup>24</sup>

was

## An Introduction concerning Catechizing,

¶ Joel 2. 16.

was rather that of their instructors than theirs, so young and incapable of vice they may seem to have been. For not only doth the Hebrew give them the title of *little children*, but the *Septuagint* add *μικρά* to *παιδία* to expresse them. Not unlike is the evidence we have of Gods equal kindness for the first rudiments of Piety in them, of his considering their *stammering of Christ* (as one of the *Ancients* expresse'd it) as well as their *prattling* against his Prophets. For though there occurs not to me any expresse proof of that, yet I think I may *a fortiori* conclude it from *Joel's* requiring the Jewish *children*, and *those that suck'd the breasts*, to be present at their solemn *Assembly*, as well as the elder sort. For if their presence be of any avail to the appeasing of God, as the *Prophets* summoning them in order to it doth sufficiently perswade, it is not unreasonable to believe he will be more affected with those instances they give of honouring him, how weak or imperfect soever. Which as it will yet farther commend that Catechetical instruction by which they are to be disposed to it, so will therefore leave nothing else to us to enquire, than *how it may be the most successfully perform'd*, the last thing propos'd to be discours'd of.

¶ Country Parson, cap. 21.

I said when I entreated of the *order* of Catechizing among the *Ancients*, that it was not as now by way of *Question* and *Answer*, but of *Lecture* or *Homily*; and of the substance whereof they were at length demanded an account. I will not say but that the way they then took to instruct their Catechumens was proper enough, considering the persons they had to do with. For being generally persons of years and understanding, it was not difficult for them to attend to the *series* of a discourse, and both apprehend and carry away so much of it as was of necessity to be retain'd. But as, since the persons to be Catechiz'd are now changed into *children*, that course cannot be thought so proper, considering that these must not only have meat *set before*, but *cut yea chewed* to them; So latter ages have accordingly provided for the due nourishment of them in that form of *Questions* and *Answers* by which they are now instructed. For not only is the doctrine of Christianity by this means broken into several pieces, but those several pieces so fitted and prepared for them that they may be easily digested by their *memories*, which is all at first we are either to expect from them, or intend. As for the giving the persons Catechiz'd a due *understanding* of them, that is another work, but which might no doubt be perform'd by the same method, only *altering the order of the Questions to be ask'd*, and *mixing* therewith such other *dependent questions* and *illustrations* thereupon, as may let them yet more into the sense of them. Of which if any man desire a *specimen*, he may meet with one in the ingenious *Herbert*<sup>1</sup>, and who hath said enough in this, as well as in all other particulars, to shew what we of the inferior Clergy ought to be and do. But as this is a work which few men are fitted for, and the services that are now generally requir'd of us leave neither space nor leisure for; so it may not unhappily be suppli'd by frequently examining our Catechumens about those things which are the expresse arguments of our own Catechism, and discoursing from the Scripture upon the several heads of it. For as our own Catechism is so plain, that it cannot well fail to be understood in time, if it be but kept up in their memories, and frequently inculcated

on



## and the Catechism of the Church of England.

on them; So the Pulpit, because it must do all, may supply the rest, and so the *old* and *new* form of Catechizing unite to the enlightning of them. Till the world shall grow so wise as to believe that a man may with as much profit to his people, and with as little ease to himself, preach from the *desk* as from the *Pulpit*, a *better method* than this will, I believe, be hardly thought of: And if I may do any service to the *Church of England* by the following *discourses*, it is upon the matter wholly owing to it; as having been forced to supply my own charge this way with such a knowledge of the principles of Christianity, as I thought it my duty to afford them. Instead therefore of pursuing that Argument any farther, which either already *has* or must not receive its due from me, I will set my self to reflect upon that particular *Catechism*, which is to be the subject of all the following explication.

When *England* began to grow weary both of the corruptions and the usurpations of the Church of *Rome*, and there wanted not a *Prince* who was prompted by his own private affections to help toward the removing of them; nothing was judg'd of more importance to it, than to bring the world to a clear understanding of the *principles* of that Religion, which had been so long and so unhappily depriv'd. In order thereunto, as the *Creed*, the *Lords Prayer*, and the *Ten Commandments* were not undeservedly look'd upon as the most comprehensive of them; so, by the advice of those Prelates that were then about him, an injurction was procur'd from *Henry the eighth* in the year 1536. by which all Curates were requir'd to teach the people to say them in the *English tongue*, together with the *Ave-mary*. And this I take to be the first foundation of that Catechism of our Church, into the story whereof we are now enquiring. But the diligence even of those ticklish times could not rest here, especially considering they were to make provision for those who were but now coming out of the dark, and had not as yet been acquainted with an *English Bible*. Therefore to furnish them with an exposition of those things which they had now been taught in their Mother tongue, by the direction of the same Prince<sup>a</sup>, and the appointment of a Convocation in the year 1537. a Book was compil'd under the title of *The Institution of a Christian man*. Which Book having for some time lien dormant, by reason of the severity that was then shewed toward those that favoured a more thorough Reformation; was after some amendments by the *King* and *Archbishop Cranmer* referred to a Convocation in the year 1543, and, after an approbation from it, published under the name of *A necessary doctrine and erudition for any Christian man*. It was a long time before I could get a sight of it, but in the end through the favour of the *Lord Bishop of Lincoln* I obtain'd a *Latin Version* of it, and printed in the year following. By the *Preface* to which as I soon saw, that the designs of it and our Catechism did so far correspond, as to aim alike at a summary of Christian Religion, so I found by the *body* of it, that there was as near an agreement between them as to their sense in those Arguments which were common to them both (I mean the *Creed*, the *Commandments*, and the *Lords Prayer*) as the diversity of the times wherein they were fram'd, and their different manner of proceeding would allow; Our Catechism, because written only for the younger sort, giving only an abstract of those heads of doctrine, which

<sup>a</sup> Heylin's Hist. of Reform. pag. 20. of the Hist. of Edw. 6<sup>th</sup>.

<sup>b</sup> Heylin ibid. pag. 19, 20.

## *An Introduction concerning Catechizing,*

which that Book, because written for men of riper years, is more particular in the explication of. I instance first for a proof of this agreement in the *Second Commandment*, which it is well known was among the *Papists* not only look'd upon as but an *Appendix* to the *first*, but upon that pretence left out in their accounts of the Decalogue: Which notwithstanding, and the tenderness of the Authors of that Book in speaking out against Images, as which the times that then were could not well bear, yet have the words of that Commandment not only found a place in it as well as in our Catechism, but been represented as a *distinct precept*. Not unlike is the evidence we have of the agreement of their *Explications* as to the *Commandments* and the *Lords Prayer*, in which alone our Catechism is any thing particular. For thus, to instance only in the former of these, they agree as to their explications of the *fourth* and *fifth* Commandments. For whereas that Book makes the main design of the *fourth* to be as to us Christians *a rest from the works of the flesh and sin, as that too, not only upon every seventh day, but at all hours and moments*; Our Catechism (as may appear by the close of that account which it gives of our *duty toward God*) represents it also as the main design of the same Commandment *to serve God truly all the days of our life*, and accordingly takes notice of no other. In like manner, whereas the forementioned Book represents it as the design of the *fifth* Commandment, that we should give honour *to all other our Superiors* as well as *our Parents*, and particularly to *Princes and their Deputies*, to *Bishops, Priests and Ministers* of the Church, to *Masters of families, and aged persons*, and in fine, *to all that have any Authority over us*; Our Catechism instructs us also to believe, that we are thereby taught to *honour and obey the King, and all that are put in Authority under him, to submit our selves to all our Governours, teachers, spiritual Pastours, and Masters, and in fine, to order our selves reverently and lowly to all our betters*. And though it be not to be deny'd, that there is some difference between their *Explications*, and particularly as to the *tenth* Commandment, as which is represented by that Book as striking at those *first motions or stirrings of sin call'd concupiscence*, but by our Catechism, and I think not without reason, at the *coveting of that which is anothers*: Yet whosoever shall compare the *main* both of the one and the other together, will find, I no way doubt, that as that Book preceded the Catechism in time, so the Authors of this latter wrote after its copy, or rather (because there is reason enough to believe that the Authors of both were some of them the same persons) that they digested those things in the Catechism in a shorter form, which they had been more large upon in the other. For which cause, as well as to serve the world with a more full explication of the Catechism, and such a one as had sometime the Authority of this Church and Nation to warrant it, I would have subjoin'd so much of it at least as respects the *Creed*, were it not for some few passages therein, which were more agreeable to those early days, than they can be supposed to be unto the present. I may not omit to add one farther proof of that Book and our Church Catechism's coming out of the same forge, or rather of this latter having been modelled by the former. For though in our *present edition* of the Church Catechism the *second, third, fourth, and fifth* Commandments are describ'd at full length with the reasons and motives thereunto; yet those reasons and motives are alike omitted

## and the Catechism of the Church of England.

omitted in that Necessary doctrine and erudition for any Christian man, and in that Catechism which was publish'd in the first edition of Edward the Sixth's Liturgy: The Second Commandment in both reaching no farther than those words, *Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them*, The Third importing no more, than *Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain*, The Fourth than *Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day*, nor the Fifth any more, than *Honour thy Father and thy Mother*: For though these may seem to be but trifling instances in themselves, yet are they in conjunction with the forementioned proofs no contemptible arguments of the Agreement of that Book and the Catechism of our Church, or rather of this latter's (because the latter also in time) having been framed by the former.

Having thus shewn what was done in the Church of England by way of preparation to the present Catechism, and (if I mistake not) discover'd also its both Original and Exemplar, I will now go on to those more happy days, wherein our Liturgy and the Catechism were fram'd. Only as a work of that nature could not be suddenly accomplished; nor could advis'dly be precipitated, so our first Reformers therefore contented themselves in the mean time to procure from Edward the sixth in the first year of his Reign certain Injunctions<sup>i</sup> in the place of it: By vertue of which it was more particularly requir'd that every holy day<sup>k</sup> throughout the year when they had no Sermon, those who had cures of Souls should immediately after the Gospel openly and plainly recite to their Parishioners in the Pulpit, The Pater noster, Credo, and Ten Commandments in English, to the intent that the people might learn the same by heart; Exhorting also all parents and householders to teach their children and servants the same, as they were bound by the Law of God, and in conscience to do. Order was also given by the same Injunctions, that the same persons<sup>l</sup> should in Confessions in Lent examine every person that came to confession to them, whether they could recite the Articles of their faith, the Pater noster, and the Ten Commandments in English, and hear them say the same particularly, wherein if they were not perfect, they should declare then, that every Christian person ought to know the said things before they should receive the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar, and admonish them to learn the said necessary things more perfectly, or else that they ought not to presume to come to God's board without a perfect knowledge, and will to observe the same, and if they did, it would be to the great peril of their Souls, and also to the worldly rebuke, that they might incur hereafter by the same. And thus matters continued, at least as to our own Catechism, till in the second year of Edward the sixth and in the year of our Lord 1548., that Prince did in the first of September of the same year convene before him<sup>m</sup> the Archbishop of Canterbury, and certain of the most learned and discreet Bishops, and other learned men of this Realm, and committed to their care the framing of that Publick Liturgy which was afterwards in the same year confirmed by Act of Parliament, and wherein among other things this Catechism of our Church was (saving only that, as was before observ'd, some of the Commandments were not describ'd at full length) as far as to the Doctrine of the Sacraments. And certainly, as it was a work of great piety and prudence, and so estimated by that Par-

<sup>i</sup> See the Collection of Articles, Injunctions, &c. by Bp. Sparrow.  
<sup>k</sup> Injunct. 4.

<sup>l</sup> Injunct. 9.

<sup>m</sup> Heylin. Hist. of Reform. p. 64. of the Hist. of Edw. 6.



## An Introduction concerning Catechizing,

<sup>a</sup> 2 & 3 Ed. 6.  
6. 1.

• Heylin. *Hist.*  
of Reform. pag.  
57. of *Hist.* of  
Edw. 6.

liament by which it was confirm'd, insomuch that they stuck not to declare it to have been compos'd by the aid<sup>n</sup> of the holy Ghost<sup>s</sup>. So it may not therefore be amiss for me also to help to continue the names of its Compilers to posterity, and so much the rather because what they thus commended unto others, some of them afterwards seal'd with their own blood. For though I do not find the like certainty about those who compos'd the first *Order of the Communion*, and which afterwards with some alteration became a part of our Publick Liturgy, yet I find no doubt at all of the Compilers of the Liturgy it self, as who were ° *Thomas Cranmer* Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and particularly remembered by the Act before mentioned, *Thomas Goodrick* Bishop of *Ely*, *Henry Holbeck* Bishop of *Lincolne*, *George Day* Bishop of *Chichester*, *John skip* Bishop of *Hereford*, *Thomas Thirlby* Bishop of *Westminster*, *Nicolas Ridley* Bishop of *Rochester*, *Richard Cox* Almoner to the King, and Dean of *Christ-Church*, Doctor *May* Dean of *St. Pauls*, Doctor *Taylor* then Dean and after Bishop of *Lincoln*, Doctor *Haynes* Dean of *Exeter*, Doctor *Robertson* afterwards Dean of *Durham*, and Doctor *Ridley* afterwards Master of *Trinity* Colledge in *Cambridge*. Such were the persons to whom we owe the *Liturgy* of our Church, and (so far as is before describ'd) the *Catechism* also thereof: And should, which God avert, those days return again which preceded the Composition of it, and which alone can teach us how to value the mercy we now enjoy by it, we should then no doubt, but in vain, endeavour to recal that Religion, which now with might and main we endeavour to destroy.

† Crackanth.  
*Defens. Eccl.*  
*Angl. contra*  
*Spalat. c. 69.*  
9 Summe and  
Substance of the  
Conference, pag.  
44.

\* Hamon *L'e-*  
*strange Alli-*  
*ance of Divine*  
*Offices, c. 9.*  
pag. 267.

But not to bode any thing of ill concerning our Liturgy, or any part of it, which, I hope, God will preserve for its own sake, and for the piety of those many persons who both revere and use it; Pass we on to give an account of that *addition* which was after made to it in the *Doctrine of the Sacraments*, which till the days of *King James* was wanting in it. In order whereunto we are to know, that when, upon the complaint of certain persons, who disrelished the then Constitution of our Church, a *Conference* was appointed at *Hampton Court* in the year 1603. to examine the Allegations that were made against it, Dr. *Reinolds* (who, as we learn from a credible Authour P, was no complainant himself, but appointed by *King James* to manage the cause of those that were) did on the *second day* of that Conference alledge among other things Q, that the *Catechism*, as it then was, was too brief, and prayed that instead of that of *Nowell* Dean of *St. Pauls*, which was commonly added to supply the shortness of the other, one uniform *Catechism* might be made, which and none other should be receiv'd. The *Doctor's* request was judged reasonable by *King James*, but yet so that he would have it in the fewest and plainest terms that might be; And, as it had then been demanded of the *Doctor* by some in the behalf of the Church, whether if to the short *Catechism* in the *Communion Book* something were added for the *Doctrine of the Sacraments* it would not serve, so it was referred to the Bishops to consider of an addition to it in that concernment, which was accordingly made, in that excellent frame we now see it, by Dr. *Overal* R then Dean of *St. Pauls*, and afterwards approved of by the other. By which means at length the *Catechism* came to be compleated, and nothing therefore left to us to enquire but *what there is in it so per-*  
*fected to recommend it to the world.*

Now

## and the Catechism of the Church of England.

Now there are two things which seem most worthy of commendation in it, and which therefore ought not to be *passed by* by him, who professeth an explication of it, the *Introduction to*, and the *Body of it*. That which I think worthy of notice in the *Introduction to it*, is both its delivering the due importance of the Sacrament of Baptism, and beginning with an account of our vow in and obligation by it. For whereas of later days men have either thrown off the Sacrament of Baptism, or at least not represented it, as indeed it is, as the *stipulation of a good conscience toward God*, our Church, in this Catechism of hers, hath not only delivered the true notion of it, but begun its demands of the Catechumen with the mention of that solemn vow, which he then enter'd into, to undertake that Christian life to which he pretends; so beginning its instructions there where the Catechumen's obligation begins, and which whilst he reflects upon, he cannot but think himself under the straiter tie to the pursuit of that Faith and Piety, which the body of the Catechism is intended to let him into the knowledge of. But to pass from the *Introduction* to the *body* of the Catechism, and which will soon appear to be no less worthy of our regard, if these three things be considered; *First* that it gives a sufficient account of that doctrine, which it professeth to explain; *Secondly*, that it delivers it in such terms, as are the most plain and familiar; as *Thirdly*, that it doth all this with all imaginable brevity. Of the two latter of these I shall not need to say any thing, partly because they are sufficiently apparant, and partly because its *brevity* and *plainness* are it may be the only things that have brought it into contempt. As if weak understandings, and young memories could better, or indeed any other way be provided for, and seems to me not unlike the reproach which Archbishop *Spotswood*<sup>1</sup> tells us was sometime cast upon a like Catechism published by the Scottish Bishops, and which, because of the lowness of its price, was it seems held in as low an esteem, and by the vulgar reproachfully stil'd, *The two-penny Faith*. But let us suppose (for other objections than that are not worthy of attending to, or answering) let us suppose, I say, that the quarrel against it is, that it is too short to give a *sufficient account* of that Faith which it professeth to explain. That indeed, if well grounded, would prove a very material Objection against it, and such as all other its qualifications would not make amends for. But how far it is from being so, since the *Doctrine of the Sacraments* was added to it, will soon appear if we consider either that *Salvation* which Christianity proposeth, or the *means* of it, within one of which two all Christian doctrines will be found to lie. The former of these again as we learn to be a Salvation from sin, by the account which the Scripture gives<sup>2</sup> of the name of him who is the Author of it, so it comprehends within it a Salvation from its pollution, and guilt, and punishment. But more than that as it cannot be thought to comprehend, unless we moreover add thereto those positive happinesses which follow upon it, which yet are no less provided for in the Catechism we are now upon; so we shall find that Catechism to acquaint us with each of these, because assuring us as to the *first*, of a sanctification by the Holy Ghost, as to the *second* of forgiveness of sins, as to the *third*, and those happinesses that follow upon it, of the Resurrection of the body and everlasting life after it. But neither is the Catechism less particular in giving an account of the *means* of salvation, than it is of that *salvation* it self; as will appear if

<sup>1</sup>History of the Church of Scotland, lib. 2. p. 92.

<sup>2</sup>Mat. 3. 21.

---

## *An Introduction concerning Catechizing, &c.*

---

we consider the insight it gives us into *natural religion*, and which Christianity confirms, or into that which is more properly *Christian*. As to the former of these it teacheth us to believe that there is one and but one God, that that God is *Almighty*, and *the maker of heaven and earth*; it prompts us consequently to believe that we our selves are the workmanship of his hands, and that as such we owe duty and service to him. It gives us more particularly to understand wherein this *our duty to God* considered as such consists, what duty we owe him as to his Creatures and our Brethren, and what duty in relation to our selves. And because even nature it self teacheth us, and our own weakneses and infirmities much more, that nothing of the former nature can be done by us without him, it both prompts us to believe a necessity of his *grace*, and shews what kind of *prayers* we ought to employ for the procuring of it. Thus the Catechism manifestly instructs us as to *natural religion*, and it is no less minute as to that which is *supernatural*, and which in truth is more properly *Christian*. For it teacheth us again *as to God*, that this divine nature of his subsists in three persons, and *as to our selves* (which is indeed the ground of all supernatural religion) that we our selves stand in need of more especial influences from it and them. It teacheth us to believe that we are *by nature born in sin and children of wrath*, and that, because we are so, God must be appealed, and we our selves purged in order to our deliverance from what we are so born in. It teacheth us to believe as to the *former*, that the Son of God became man and died, and so *redeemed all mankind* from that wrath which was their former portion; as to the *latter*, that as that God hath sent his holy spirit to sanctify us, so he hath appointed two Sacraments to convey that spirit and his sanctifying grace into us: By the former of which we are *begotten unto righteousness*, by the latter *continued and strengthened in it*. In fine, that it might not be wanting in any thing, which might bring us to partake of that Salvation which Christianity proposeth, and which those two Sacraments are appointed to be the conveyers of, it gives us to understand what is requir'd on our part to the right reception of them, and how we ought to be qualified to receive the full benefit of them. Only as how particular soever this or any other Catechism may be, they who instill them into the younger sort will find that they will require from them some further deductions, and explications, and illustrations, so, to contribute to so useful a work, as well as to build men up in their most holy Faith, I have undertaken the following Explication, which next to the honour of *God*, I do most humbly devote to the service of that *Church*, whose Catechism I have taken upon me to explain.



A N  
EXPLICATION  
OF THE  
CATECHISM  
OF THE  
**Church of England,**

PART I.

Containing An

EXPLICATION  
OF THE  
**Preliminary Questions**

AND

ANSWERS

Of it, and of the

APOSTLES CREED,

As it is a Part of, and Interpreted by the same.



OF THE  
METHUEN

Church of England

PARISH  
OF

OF THE  
METHUEN

2

2

---

THE  
CATECHISM  
OF THE  
Church of England.

---

PART I.

---

**W**hat is your name ? *Question.*  
N. or M. *Answer.*

Who gave you this name ? *Question.*  
*Answer.*

My Godfathers and Godmothers in my Baptism, wherein I was made a Member of Christ, the Child of God, and an Inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven.

*Question.*  
What did your Godfathers and Godmothers then for you ?  
*Answer.*

They did promise and vow three things in my name. First, That I should renounce the Devil and all his Works, the pomps and vanity of this wicked World, and all the sinful Lufts of the Flesh. Secondly, That I should believe all the Articles of the Christian Faith. And thirdly, That I should keep Gods holy will and Commandments, and walk in the same all the days of my Life.

*Question.*  
Dost thou not think that thou art bound to believe, and to do, as they have promised for thee ?

*Answer.*  
Yes verily ; and by Gods help so I will. And I heartily thank our Heavenly Father, that he hath called me to this state of Salvation, through Jesus Christ our Saviour. And I pray unto God to give me his grace, that I may continue in the same unto my lives end.

*Catechist.*  
Rehearse the Articles of thy belief.

*Answer.*  
I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth.  
And in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord, Who was conceived by the Holy

---

## *The Catechism of the Church of England.*

---

Holy Ghost, Born of the Virgin *Mary*, Suffered under *Pontius Pilate*, Was crucified, dead and buried, He descended into Hell; The third day he rose again from the dead, He ascended into Heaven, And sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty: From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

I believe in the Holy Ghost, The Holy Catholick Church, The Communion of Saints, The forgiveness of sins, The resurrection of the Body, And the life everlasting. *Amen.*

Question.

*What dost thou chiefly learn in these Articles of thy belief?*

Answer.

First, I learn to believe in God the Father, who hath made me and all the World.

Secondly, In God the Son, who hath redeemed me and all mankind.

Thirdly, In God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me, and all the elect people of God.

---

AN

---



---

I

---

AN  
EXPLICATION  
OF THE  
Preliminary Questions  
AND  
ANSWERS  
OF THE  
CATECHISM  
OF THE  
Church of England.

*Wherein, after a General Introduction to the whole, inquiry is made why the Catechism begins with What is your Name? Of the reason of that Question, and of the imposition of Names in Baptism by the Godfathers and Godmothers. What the ground of the institution of Godfathers and Godmothers is? the promises they make for us, and our obligation to perform them. A conclusion of the whole with the duty of Godfathers and Godmothers, and what persons ought to be made choice of for that office.*

**T**Here being nothing which is more desir'd, or more wanted The Introduction. in the Church of England, than a just Institution of Christian Religion according to the Doctrine of it, it may seem a wonder unto many, as it did for some time to me, that no man yet should have the hardiness to attempt it. But considering with my self, what I afterwards found by my own dear experience, that it was a work of greater difficulty than an ordinary understanding is able to master, and of more time and patience than the generality of men are willing to bestow; I began to think it much more reasonable to wonder at my self, for having only entertain'd a thought concerning

it: for what was I, that I should hope, or at least with any advantage to the Church, to accomplish so difficult and so laborious an enterprize? And certainly had not my own *zeal* to the work, as well as the encouragement of others, thrust me on, I had given over in the midst, and contented my self to wish, as others hitherto have, that God would stir up some man by whom it might in fine be done. But as what is so fitting to be done ought however to be attempted, if it were only to prompt men of better parts to set themselves to the doing of it; so what I want of ability for it, I will endeavour to supply by an unwearied diligence, and, what is undoubtedly of more force, by imploring the assistance of him, who out of the Mouths of *Babes* and *Sucklings* doth oftentimes perfect praise: And with these assurances and the direction of the *Catechism* of our Church, which is the most perfect Abridgment of the Doctrine of Christianity, and its own, I will now set my self to shew, what the *purport* of that Religion is, into which it baptizeth us, and which we all make profession to embrace.

Quest. What is  
your name?  
Answ. N. or M.

Now the first *Question* that *Catechism* puts is, *What the name* of the Catechized person is; and which, because but an Introduction to others, I could well enough have been content to let alone, if the maligners of our Church could have been content to do so too. But because even this, how innocent soever, cannot escape their censure, who do not lightly approve of any thing but what is done by themselves, I will, as trifling as it may seem to be, bestow an Animadversion on it, if it were only to shew, that the supposed weakness of the Church of *England* is stronger than all the reason of its opponents. For not to tell such persons, that it is but after the mode of other Dialogues, which are not wont to fall presently upon that which they principally intend, neither is that question, if we consider of whom it is ask'd, unreasonable to be put, nor impertinent to those discoveries it is intended to introduce. For is it not of Children that that question is demanded, of Children in understanding as well as Grace? And ought not such to be led by familiar and easy Questions to those which are more abstruse and difficult? What other

\* Heb. 5. 13, 14.

construction can any man make of that of the Author to the *Hebrews* \*, where he tells us, that *strong meat belongeth unto them that are of full age, but to such as are babes milk*? For if those that are Babes in Christ must be so fed, much more those who are also Babes in understanding, Children in Nature's School as well as in our Saviour's. *When I was a child* (saith St. Paul †) *I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child*; so I did, neither was it possible for me to do otherwise. And if a Child can only think and understand as a Child, then must we also speak to such a one as to a Child, and according to his weak capacity. But neither is that question any thing more impertinent than unreasonable, if we consider what name it requires an account of. For inquiring as the *Catechism* doth, not after the Child's *surname* but *Christian* one, even that which he receiv'd in Baptism, it suggests to him that most excellent Religion he receiv'd together with it, and under that name promis'd to maintain and cleave unto. By which means, as one hath well observ'd, this so much derided Question of *What is your name*, is all one in effect with *What Religion do you profess*? wherewith other *Catechisms* begin.

† 1 Cor. 13. 11.

But because whatever that Question is, it was no doubt especially intended as an Introduction to more material ones, therefore proceed we to that which is next in order, and so much the rather, because it leads directly

directly to that Religion which we are upon the investigation of: That Catechism which asks in the next words, *Who gave the Catechumen his name*, prompting him immediately to answer, *My Godfathers and Godmothers in my Baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ, the Child of God and an inheritour of the Kingdom of Heaven.* Of the latter part of this Answer it will be time enough to give an account, when I come to entreat of the Sacraments at the latter end of the Catechism; and therefore I will confine my self at present to the use of Godfathers and Godmothers, and those names they are here said to impose.

Now there are three things to be inquir'd concerning those names which are the subject of our present consideration; for *what cause* impos'd, why impos'd *in Baptism*, and why *by the God-fathers* rather than *by the Parents*.

Concerning the first of these much need not be said, because it is notorious that the principal ground of their imposition is to distinguish men from each other, and particularly from those of the same stock. Only as nothing hinders, that, what may have some one thing for its principal ground, may yet have other subordinate ones; so this of the imposition of Christian names, or of such as were analogical thereto, had also for it's, the *preserving the memory* of the parties *Ancestors*, and whose actions as well as names they were thus willing to transmit unto Posterity, their serving for a *memorial* to themselves and others of some *remarkable accident* or *notable blessing*, or for an *incitement* to the parties concern'd to *imitate the virtues* of those whose names were thus imposed on them. Of the first of these that of St. Luke \* may serve for a proof, where he speaks concerning the naming of John the Baptist; the Kindred of that holy person not only calling him *Zacharias* after the name of his Father, but representing it as a sufficient bar to that name which his Mother recommended, that there was *none of his Kindred* called by it. And though among us it be not so usual, which is the second of the grounds before assign'd, to make the names which are impos'd bear the Character of some remarkable accident or notable blessing; yet it was so much the mode of the Jewish Nation, as we learn from the Scriptures of the Old Testament, that there are few eminent names there recorded, which do not carry such signatures upon them, and are accordingly taken notice of there. The only ground therefore to be accounted for is that of their being intended as an incitement to the parties concern'd to imitate the virtues of those whose names they bear. A thing which hath the practice of all times † and Nations to warrant, because making use especially of those names which their own relations or others had signaliz'd by their virtuous actions. From whence as it doth appear, that names have not been given at adventure, or barely to distinguish men from each other, so may prompt us in imitation of our Forefathers to continue the same course, yea make our demeanour and actions answer the virtues of those whose names we are willing to assume. Otherwise those very names will serve rather to reproach us, because suggesting to our selves and others the great worth of those men, with whom we have nothing common but the name.

Quest. Who gave you this name?  
Answ. My Godfathers and Godmothers in my Baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ, the Child of God, and an inheritour of the Kingdom of Heaven.

\* Luke i. 59; 61.

† For that of the Antient Christians this following passage would be added. Πολλοὶ δὲ ὁμωνύμους ἰσχυροῦ τοῦ Σπυρίτου τοῦ ἁγίου, οἱ δὲ διὰ τὸ πρὸς ἐκείνους ἀγαπᾶν, καὶ τὸ δαυδαῖον καὶ ἡλὲν, ἀγα-

ποθῆναι τε ὁμοίως αὐτοῦ βύλασαι καὶ τὸ κρυβεῖν, καὶ αὐτὴν ἐπαρρησίαν ἡσυχάσαντο, ὅσπερ ὁ Παῦλος οὐλοῦν, καὶ δὲ ὁ Πέτρος ἐν τοῖς ἡνὶ πνεύματι πασὶν ὀνομαζέται. Dionys. Alex. in lib. de promissis apud Euseb. Eccl. Hist. li. 7. c. 25.

From the general reasons of their imposition, pass we to that of its being done in Baptism, as to which the present Question is intended to



lead us. A thing which was certainly of a more mysterious signification than some men seem willing to allow. For though the time of Baptism or Circumcision might be made choice of, because of the Company it generally draws to it, and who might therefore in after-times serve as witnesses of the name imposed, if any controverſie should arise concern-

<sup>a</sup> Grot. in Luc. i. 59.

<sup>b</sup> Suet. in Nerone. Ejuſdem futura ſalutatis ſignum evidens die luſtrico extitit. Nam C. Ceſar, rogante ſore ut infanti quod vellet nomen daret, intuens Claudium Patrum ſuum, a quo mox Prin- cipe Nero adoptatus eſt, ejus ſe dixit dare.

<sup>c</sup> Ἀμφιδόμια, ἡμέτερον ἀγο- μένη τοῖς πατρίοις, ἐν ᾗ τὸ βῆρος πῶς ἐστὶν ὁρίσασθαι τῶν ἡμετέρων καὶ ἐκείνων αὐτῶν ὄνομα ὅτι ὅταν ᾖ δεικνύειν καὶ φίλων δῶρα ἐπιμνηστέα.

ing it; yet when I can learn from thoſe who ſo opine, <sup>a</sup> that the Heathen themſelves <sup>b</sup> made uſe of the time of their luſtrations of Infants for it; when I conſider that among the Romans the day of luſtration of Infants was for that reaſon ſtiled *Nominalis*, and that the Greeks when they carried the Child round about the Hearth (which was undoubtedly a Ceremony of Conſecrating them to their Houſhold Gods) did alſo then impoſe names upon them, as *Heſychius* <sup>c</sup> tells us in the word Ἀμφιδόμια, I cannot forbear to ſay, that the reaſon of them all was to intimate, that we then begin to be *ſomebody*, when we are conſecrated unto God. Before their Circumciſion and Luſtrations, and ſo likewiſe before our Baptiſm, before that, I ſay, Infants were

*nullius nominis*, perſons of no account, nor thought worthy to have a name impoſed on them. That which muſt procure them that, muſt be their dedication unto God, their Sanctification by the Miniſtry of his Prieſts. Sure I am as to Baptiſm this is yet more apparent, that much better Circumciſion and Luſtration: for without this Sanctification we are perſons of none or very bad account, without Chriſt, and ſtrangers to the Covenant of Promiſe. If we have any name without it, it is an empty one, it is ſuch a one as they retain, who are entred into the ſtate of the dead, and ſo ceaſe to be any thing in the World. Which as it may well prompt us to ſet a value upon our Baptiſm, and upon that name we receive in and by it; ſo I know not how to recommend it with more advantage, than by what is reported of *Lewes* the Ninth of *France*, otherwiſe call'd *St. Lewes*. For being ask'd by what Title he would be diſtinguiſhed from the reſt of his Predeceſſors after his Death, he made no other Answer than *Lewes of Poſſi*. Of which being farther demanded an account, becauſe there were other places of much more repute, and which he himſelf had ſignaliz'd by his Victories, he ſilenced them by replying that he deſir'd to be ſtil'd *Lewes of Poſſi*, becauſe there it was that he obtain'd the greateſt Victory he ever had, even that over the Devil, meaning that he was *Chriſtend* there.

I will conclude this Diſcourſe concerning Names, when I have aſſign'd a reaſon of their impoſing them, who are our God-fathers or Fathers in God, rather than our natural Parents. Not that I think exceptions againſt ſuch things as theſe ought much to be conſidered, but becauſe even this very thing ſeems not to be without great reaſon. For when it is mani- feſt that the name in queſtion belongs to a new birth, and ſuch as we derive not from our Parents but God; how reaſonable may it be thought to take the impoſing it from the natural Parent, and commit it to one who is appointed in Gods ſtead to be an inſtrument in bringing us unto himſelf? As becauſe the natural Parent hath no concernment in that birth; ſo becauſe it will then appear moſt clearly to be from God, when the name that belongs to it, is committed to ſuch a one as hath not the like relation to us.

Having thus given an account of our Chriſtian Names, and the Gi- vers of them, I mean conſidered as ſuch; we are now, as the Catechiſm directs,

directs, to look upon them in another notion, and as *stipulating* for us in Baptism. For beside that it is, with respect to that, that they are *fil'd* Godfathers and Godmothers, as the Answer but now animadverted upon shews; the Catechism goes on to enquire *what* these Fathers and Mothers *did* for their respective Children in it, and accordingly brings them in answering that *they did promise and vow three things* in their name; *First, that they should renounce the Devil and all his works, the pomps and vanities of this wicked world, and all the sinful lusts of the flesh. Secondly, that they should believe all the Articles of the Christian Faith. And thirdly, that they should keep Gods holy will and Commandments, and walk in the same all the days of their life.* From whence as it doth appear what the design of their Institution is, and what things they promise and vow for us; so we will accordingly make it our business, first to shew the *reasonableness* of their Institution, and then enquire into the *particulars* of that stipulation into which they enter.

and all the *sinful lusts of the flesh.* Secondly, that I should believe all the *Articles of the Christian Faith.* And thirdly, that I should keep Gods holy will and Commandments, and walk in the same all the days of my life.

Quest. *What did your Godfathers and Godmothers then for you?*  
 Answ. They did promise and vow three things in my name. First, that I should renounce the Devil and all his works, the pomps and vanities of this wicked world;

It is a known saying of *Tertullian*, \* and oftentimes cast in our teeth by those who seem to be no great friends, either to the Baptism of Infants, or the Institution of Godfathers. *What necessity is there that those sponsors should thrust themselves into danger, because even they by reason of their mortality may be hindered from performing their promises, but however be deceived by the product of their evil inclinations for whom they undertake?* The Lord indeed saith, *do not hinder little Children from coming unto me. Let them come therefore when they are grown, let them come when they are in a capacity to learn, and may be taught whither they are to come. Let them in fine be made Christians, when they may be able to know Christ.* I will not now stand to shew, how unluckily this passage is alledg'd, either against the Baptism of Infants, or that by Godfathers, because it shews the practice of the Church to have been against his opinion who is urg'd as disputing against them both. But this I say, that supposing the Baptism of Infants to be good, as they who dispute against the Institution of Godfathers generally do, and I my self shall in due place make appear, there can be nothing more rational than that Institution of Godfathers, nor yet more agreeable to the design of that Baptism to which they are admitted. For the evidencing whereof, I shall lay for my ground that account which *St. Peter* † gives of it; where, after he had taken notice of the Ark of *Noah*, and of those eight souls that were saved in it by water, he tells us, that *the like figure thereunto even Baptism doth now save us, not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the Answer of a good Conscience towards God.*

\* *Quid enim necesse est sponsoribus etiam periculo ingeri? quia & ipsi per mortalitatem destituere promissiones suas possunt, & proventu male indolis falli. At quidem Dominus, Nolite illos prohibere ad me venire. Veniant ergo dum adolescent; veniant dum discunt, dum conveniant docentur. Fiant Christiani quum Christum nosse potuerint. De Baptismo. c. 18.*

† *1 Pet. 3. 21.*

In which words there are these two things observable to our present purpose.

1. The thing that saves us, that is to say Baptism.
2. That *of* or *in* it, which contributes most to our Salvation, even the Answer of a good Conscience toward God.

1. That Baptism, yea Baptism properly so call'd, is the thing here said to save us, no doubt at all can be made by those who consider it as a figure or antitype of that Salvation, which is spoken of in the foregoing Verse. For inasmuch as that was a Salvation *by water* as well as from it, and is accordingly so express'd even by *St. Peter* himself (the same water that was to others an occasion of destruction, serving to them as a means of Salvation, because bearing up that Ark in which they were bestowed)

what

what account can be given of the resemblance that is here said to be between them, unless we will suppose the Baptism here understood to be that of water? That resemblance being not to be made out, unless there be something in the Baptism we speak of to answer the water by which those eight Souls are said to have been sav'd, as well as that Ark in which they were. Neither will it avail to say, that St. Peter himself seems to exclude that Baptism, when he adds, immediately after the mention of Baptism, *not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the Answer of a good Conscience towards God*. Because first, that expression of his doth not necessarily exclude the Baptism of water, but only shew that in Baptism the outward washing is the least considerable, and that it is not so much the putting away the filth of the flesh, as the Answer of a Good Conscience toward God that saves. For thus the Scripture is wont to speak, when it intends not so much to exclude those things it denies, as to depretiate them in comparison with others. I alledge for the proof hereof a like passage of the Prophet Hosea \*, where he brings in God declaring that he *desired mercy and not sacrifice*, and *the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings*. For as it is not to be suppos'd that God should not then desire Sacrifice also, when he gave so many commands concerning it, so much less when he immediately adds, that he desired *the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings*: That importing Sacrifice and burnt-offerings to have been desired by him, though not in the same degree with more material duties. In like manner when St. Peter says that it is *not the putting away the filth of the flesh* that saves, *but the answer of a good Conscience towards God*, we must not think his meaning to be that the outward washing is of no force, and much less that the Baptism of water is wholly excluded (for that no doubt was the most proper anti-type of, and the most like figure to the Salvation before spoken of) But that, there being two things in Baptism, the outward washing and the answer of a good Conscience, the latter of these is the most considerable toward the saving of us. And indeed so far am I from thinking that St. Peter meant to exclude the Baptism of water, when he added immediately after, *not the putting away the filth of the flesh*, that I cannot but think on the contrary he doth rather inforce the understanding of it; He who denies Baptism to save with respect to such or such a particular effect, such as that of the putting away the filth of the flesh is, both supposing it to be capable of producing that effect, and implying its saving as to others. Now forasmuch as that Baptism which produceth the cleansing of the flesh is the Baptism here intended, forasmuch as no other Baptism can do that but the Baptism of water, it remains that the Baptism of water and no other is the Baptism that is here intended, the Baptism that saveth, not through *the putting away the filth of the flesh*, but through *the answer of a good Conscience towards God*.

Now if it should be demanded (as the question may well enough be ask'd) why so much to shew that the Baptism properly so call'd is here intended; I answer, first, because we are now discoursing of the use of Godfathers and Godmothers in it, and, which therefore if we would establish from this place, it will be necessary to shew that Baptism properly so call'd is here intended: Especially when there is some shew of reason to interpret it of the Baptism of the Spirit, as that is oppos'd to the Baptism of water, and by which the Conscience is suppos'd to be mov'd to make the answer here spoken of. I answer secondly, because, if it do appear that the Baptism of water is here meant, the putting away the filth

\* Hosea 6. 6.



flesh of the flesh, and the answer of a good Conscience toward God will not be found to be distinct Baptisms, but parts of one and the same; though the latter of the most efficacy to our Salvation. For how should they be thought to be distinct Baptisms, the former whereof is a manifest effect of the Baptism here spoken of, as the latter affirm'd to be the most material part of it? Which suppos'd, a way is open to the evincing of that which we are now in the investigation of. For if the answer of a good Conscience toward God be a part, yea the most material part of Baptism, if that Answer cannot be so advantageously made by the Infants as by their Sureties, then is there but reason, if we allow them Baptism, to allow them such also, and accept of their promises in their behalf. Setting aside therefore any farther consideration of that which is here said to save us, as which doth now sufficiently appear to be the Sacrament of Baptism, I will forthwith address my self to that part of it which is most material, both in it self, and to our purpose, even *the Answer of a good Conscience towards God.*

2. For the understanding whereof we are to know, that as the word \* we render *Answer* is a word borrowed from the Civil Law, so it is by the Masters thereof interpreted to signify a *stipulation*, whereby between two persons, the one interrogating, and the other answering, a contract was wont to be made. In process of time (as words are often either enlarged or contracted in their significations) what at first signified the whole act was also appl'd to that part of it which was made by him that answer'd, and is accordingly us'd also for sponson or promising. A notion, which, if admitted here (as there is no reason but it should) will determine Baptism to be a contract between God and Man; God by his Minister promising the assistance of his Spirit and Heaven, as man to believe in God and to serve him, or, as it is in the place I am now upon, the *sponson or promise* of a good Conscience. Though, allowing our own Translation, it will come all to one, especially if we take in the practice of the Primitive Church, which is no doubt the best comment upon the Scripture. For as the Answer here spoken of supposeth a question to be made to the Baptized person that returns it, so it is manifest, that it hath been an antient † custom in the Church of God, as still in the Church of *England*, to put questions to and exact answers from the party to be baptiz'd, both as to the Faith they had entertain'd, and the resolutions they had taken up to live according to that Religion into which they were then to be initiated. Now there are two sorts of persons which are entered into Baptism, to wit those of riper age, and infants. Concerning the former of these there cannot, as to the particular we now speak of, be any controversie between us and those who take the liberty to dissent from us as to the other; because those of riper years are both able and oblig'd by us to stipulate or contract with God for themselves. All the scruple is concerning Infants, and the answering of Godfathers for them; Which scruple will yet be found to be very unreasonable, supposing that they ought to be baptiz'd. For Baptism being a Covenanting between God and Man, a stipulation or contract between them; supposing Infants to be baptiz'd, they also must be suppos'd to Covenant with God for the performance of those things which he requires. Now forasmuch as Infants cannot exprelly and by themselves make any such Covenant with God, it remains that it be done in their name by others, which is the great use of Godfathers. Indeed no man can say that such an exprels profession of obedience to God is absolutely necessary in the Baptism of Infants, because

\* *Enigmetum*

† Tertul. de Cor. c. 3. De hinc ter mergitur, amplius aliquid respondentes quam Dominus in Evangelio determinavit.

Cyprian in Ep. ad Januarium. Sed & ipsa interrogatio que fit in Baptismo testis est veritatis. Nam cum dicimus, credis in vitam eternam, & remissionem peccatorum per sanctam Ecclesiam, intelligimus remissionem, &c.

the

the Gospel admitting them to Baptism, and requiring no such express stipulation either by themselves or others, supposeth a tacit stipulation to be enough, which their being baptized is. But neither doth the Church of England look upon such an express profession as necessary, as may be seen in the Office of *Private Baptism*; she there telling us that in case of necessity, as where the Child is like to die, it shall suffice to use this form only, I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. For let them not doubt (saith the Rubrick) *that the Child so baptiz'd is lawfully and sufficiently baptiz'd, and ought not to be baptiz'd again.* But what is absolutely necessary is one thing, and another what is expedient, which St. Paul tells us we ought to mind. Now I appeal to all sober persons, whether when the Child is suppos'd to Covenant with God to believe in him and serve him when he is able, it be not expedient for one or more in the Childs name to make profession of that Covenant with God which the Child is suppos'd to enter into; if it were but to declare to others, and to the Child when he shall come of Age, that he enter'd into such a Covenant with his Maker. For though the Baptism which the Child receives, be a *tacit* Covenanting with God, yet it is *but a tacit* one, but however is not so clear and intelligible as when the Godfathers shall in his name make profession of it, nor so apt to enforce it upon the mind of the party concern'd when he shall be of ability to consider it. And here very opportunely comes in an Answer to that so much dreaded exception of *Tertullian*, and which I shall rather consider, because it is taken up and prosecuted by all those who profess their dislike of so prudent an institution. *What necessity is there that Godfathers should thrust themselves into danger, because even they by reason of their mortality may be hindred from performing their promises, but however may be deceiv'd by the product of their evil inclinations for whom they undertake?* For beside that no man can be suppos'd to be obliged beyond his ability, and therefore not likely to suffer by his own mortality or the fallhood of others; neither do Godfathers undertake for their belief and obedience whose cause they thus seem to espouse. All that they do, is to be the mouth of their respective Pupils, and to declare that in their name, which they are not able to declare for themselves, but are as much obliged to as if they could or did. Otherwise the Question should not be put, *Dost thou in the name of this Child renounce the Devil and all his works, Dost thou believe in God, and Wilt thou obediently keep his Commandments?* but, wilt thou undertake that the Child shall do all this? which is a thing of a very distant nature. Whence it is, that this Sponson or promise is expressed by our Church sometimes by the Godfathers *promising in the Childs name*, as, at others, by the *promising of the Child by them*. All that can be suppos'd to lie upon the Godfathers is, to take care, what in them lies, that the Child perform what he hath promised by them, as that too, not by vertue of any promise of their own concerning it, but upon the account of their bringing him to, and of Gods and the Churches receiving him upon their motion and tender, and which therefore they are oblig'd both in duty and gratitude to requite by a careful supervision of him: Especially, when this is more or lesse the duty of all men whatsoever, as their several circumstances and opportunities shall give leave. I will conclude this affair with that of St. Paul, \* *But if any man seem to be contentious, and would be introducing other forms of Baptism, we have no such custom nor the Churches of God.* We have no such custom, that is most certain,

\* 1 Cor. 11. 16.

certain, the Practice of our Church and the Constitutions thereof shew, preferibing all Infants their Stipulators in Baptism, their Fathers or Mothers in God. But neither had the Churches of God of old; as is evident from the forequoted passage of *Tertullian*, nor any of the present till of late years. For to say nothing at all of the Churches of the Roman Communion, which yet can be no prejudice to us in this particular, because consenting with other Churches in this affair; the Churches of the Greek Communion have the same usage; and not a few † also of the Re-  
 form'd. And certainly, though now nothing can please but what is new, and either different from or contrary to all others: yet, if there be any thing of force in that admonition of *St. Paul*, or in those many others which inculcate peace; a sober and modest compliance with the Church of God in such things as these shall one day find better acceptance than a more laudable invention against it.

Having thus given an account of the usefulness of Godfathers in Baptism, and shewn what foundation they have both in Scripture and reason, proceed we to reflect upon what they promise in their Childrens names; which the Catechism prompts them to remember to be these three,

1. *That they should renounce the Devil and all his works, the pompes and vanities of this wicked world, and all the sinful lusts of the flesh.*
2. *That they should believe all the Articles of the Christian Faith.*
3. *That they should keep Gods holy will and Commandments, and walk in the same all the days of their life.*

I. It being the first part of wisdom to *flee vice*, or whatsoever may any way tend either to enkindle or promote it, it is not much to be wondered, that, when men were invited into a new and vertuous state; they were first call'd upon to renounce the old, and bid farewell both to it and its relations. For till these be first discarded; men shall be very ill perswaded to give entertainment to the other; and the *new creature*, as the Scripture speaks, shall either find no admittance or meet with no very friendly entertainment. Now though this was not obscurely intimated in Baptism it self, and mens putting off their cloaths in order to the reception of it; that (as *St. Paul* intimates) prompting them to *put off the old man with his deeds*, that so they might the better *put on the new man with his*; yet because, as Baptism was intended for a stipulation between God and Man, so that stipulation could not so well appear unless it were made by words express, as well as by significant Rites and Ceremonies; therefore an express and formal abrenunciation was also requir'd; and the baptized person was both once and again solemnly to profess his abdication\* of them, and particularly of the Devil and his pomps and angels. Only, as there were some evils which did at that time more manifestly prevail, than they can be supposed to have done since Christianity gain'd upon the world; so that abrenunciation of theirs was more particularly levell'd at them; and the several fountains and originals thereof. For thus by renouncing † *the Devil and his works*, was principally meant the renouncing of *Idolatry*, and particularly of that which had introdu-

\* *Aquam ad-  
turi ibidem sed  
& aliquanto  
prius in Eccle-  
sia sub Antisti-  
tis manu conte-  
stamur nos re-  
nunciare diabo-  
lo & pompe &  
angelis ejus.*

*Tert. de Coronâ c. 3. Idem de Spectac. c. 4. Cum, aquam ingressi, Christianam fidem in legis sue verba prostemur, renunciasse nos diabolo & pompe & angelis ejus ore nostro contestamur. † Quid erit summum atq; precipuum in quo Diabolus & angeli ejus censentur, quam idololatria? ex qua omnis immundus & nequam spiritus, ut ita dixerim, quia nec diutius de-  
buc. Tert. de Spectac. c. 4.*



<sup>a</sup> 1 Cor. 10. 20. ced the worship of other Gods; those (as St. Paul declares <sup>a</sup>) being rather Devils than Gods, who the better to impose upon the World had assum'd to themselves that name, and procur'd Sacrifices and other such like divine honours to themselves. By *Pompes* in like manner, as a learned man <sup>b</sup> hath observ'd, were primarily meant, not the *shews* of the Heathen (for the *Pompes* <sup>c</sup> were distinguished from them) but the solemn processions of their Gods before them, and particularly that which went before the races and combats in the Roman *Circus*: Where, as *Tertullian* <sup>d</sup> assures us, a long row of the Images of their Gods were carried through the streets, and attended, as the same *Tertullian* remarks, as with other ensigns of honour, so with the Sacrifices that were to be offered, and all the sacred implements belonging to them. Which therefore whoever went along with, or were publicly Spectators of, gave testimony thereby to the allowance of them, and of that Idolatry which they contain'd. But so we are in reason also to interpret the *sinful lusts of the flesh*, even of those more notorious ones of Fornication, Adultery, and the like; these in those elder times being scarcely reputed sins, that I say not, that they may seem to have been own'd and approv'd of by them. But as he who affirms such or such a thing to be *principally* intended, doth not thereby intend to exclude other things though of an inferiour nature, but rather to connote them; so the Abrenunciation of Baptism being now, and having always been in general terms, we are in reason to suppose those other things to be comprehended, and accordingly to be in like manner the object of our renunciation. Upon which account by renouncing the Devil and all his works, must also be meant *all dealing with* him or having to do with those that do; *pride*, which was the sin that cast him out of Heaven, *lying*, *calumniating* and the like: These, as they are by the Scripture represented as his proper crimes, so the last of them that from which he receives his name; *Satan* and *Διabolος* in their respective Languages signifying a Calumniator or false Accuser. And though the word *Pompes*, which is the next thing we renounce, had in its primary and proper sense a more restrained signification than that which we now commonly impose upon it; yet, as even then it was understood to connote their *shews* <sup>e</sup> as well as the *pomp* that preceded them, yea all that in like manner tended <sup>f</sup> to vanity; so ought we much rather to put that interpretation upon it now, because of those vanities of the world where-with they are conjoin'd: The conjunction of those obliging us to understand as alike renounc'd, all that tends to the same end, or is alike contrary to the gravity and simplicity of Christianity. Of which nature in particular, is the wearing of *indecent habits*, going *attir'd above our quality and condition*, as in fine our resorting to such *spectacles* or *shews* as minister to *vanity and lasciviousness*. Lastly, as by the *sinful lusts of the flesh* is primarily meant all acts of uncleanness, such as Fornication, Adultery, and the like, so under them, for the same reason, all *immodest looks or dalliances*, all *unclean thoughts and words*.

<sup>g</sup> quod placitum Deo non sit. Si omnia propter Diabolum instituta, & ex Diaboli rebus instructa monstravimus (nihil enim non Diaboli est, vel quicquid Dei non est, vel Deo displicet) hoc erit pompa diaboli adversus quam in signaculo fidei egeramus. Tert. de Spectac. c. 24. <sup>h</sup> He enim erant pompe diaboli & angelorum ejus, officia seculi, honores, solennitates, popularitates, falsa vota, humana servitia, laudes vane, gloria turpes. Tert. de Corona c. 13.

II. I will not say much concerning that second promise which our God-fathers make, that we should *believe all the Articles of the Christian Faith*: Not because the discussion thereof may not be proper enough here, but because I am willing to leave as much as may be to the Doctrine of

of the Sacraments, where it will be much more proper to consider it. It may suffice here to observe, that, as *without faith it is impossible to please God*, and much less under the dispensation of the Gospel; so it is not to be imagin'd that any part of *his* faith should be separated from our profession, into whose name we are especially baptiz'd.

III. For the same reason, as well as for others, I will be as brief in the consideration of that Promise, which respects our observation of *Gods holy will and commandments*, and *walking in the same all our days*. For, as the matter of Godfathers and Godmothers is that we are especially to consider, and other things only as they tend to the illustration of it; so whatever the foregoing Promises may be, this to be sure cannot be separated from that profession which they make in Baptism, in the name of those persons for whom they speak. For if (as hath been shewn but now, and will not therefore need to be repeated) Baptism be a profession of a good Conscience towards God, it must in like manner be a profession of obedience to his laws towards whom it so directs it self. Otherwise it will hardly pass for good in its own unprejudiced esteem, and how much less then in the sight and judgment of God.

But because whatever our Godfathers or Godmothers may promise in our name, it will be as nothing unto us; unless we are under an Obligation to discharge it; and because that Catechism, which hath taught us what their respective promises are, hath proceeded to enquire whether we *think not our selves obliged* by them: Therefore it will be but necessary for us to shew, as the same Catechism prompts us to answer, that we are indeed *so oblig'd*; reflecting afterwards upon that resolution it suggests to us of abiding by those promises, and upon that both *thanksgiving* which it puts into our mouths for *Gods calling us to this state of Salvation*, and prayer to him for his *Grace* that we may *continue in it to our lives end*. This as it is a part of that answer which we are taught to return, so being accordingly to be considered by us.

Quest. Dost thou not think that thou art bound to believe and do as they have promised for thee?  
Answ. Yes verily, and by Gods help so I will. And I heartily thank our heavenly father that he hath called me to this state of salvation, through

Jesus Christ our Saviour. And I pray unto God to give me his Grace, that I may continue in the same to my lives end.

To begin with that part of the Answer which is the most material, even our own obligation to conform to what our Godfathers promised for us; for the evidencing whereof I shall need only to shew that the promise by whomsoever delivered is not so much theirs as ours. For if the promise be ours, the obligation must be so too, because that is but a consequent of the other.

If we had to do with those who deni'd the Baptism of Infants, and consequently the Parents power thus to consecrate them to God, so we should be forced to make use of other arguments to establish the legitimacy of such promises, or the concerns of Children in them. But supposing the Baptism of Infants, as I have all along suppos'd, and as the Institution of Godfathers, which proceeds upon it, obligeth us to do, we shall need no other argument than that Baptism of theirs to make their concernment out. For is not Baptism in its own nature, and by the institution of the Almighty, a stipulation? Is it not a covenanting between God and Man upon such terms as he prescribes? And if so, doth it not imply a promise upon the part of him that is baptiz'd, as well as upon his into whose Religion he is admitted? But how then can Infants be exempted from that which is their part in the stipulation? Nay, how can they be suppos'd, if baptiz'd, not to promise some way for themselves what the nature of the stipulation enter'd into requires of them? It is true indeed

that Infants have no *actual volition*, and much less can they make any *declaration* concerning it, which is the very formality of a *Promise* properly so call'd. But as I pretend not to affirm that they can make any strict and proper promise, but only a *virtual* one, and such as hath the *force of a promise* in the *interpretation* of God; so that they may do the latter, is evident from their entering into Baptism which implies such a promise, and might be evidenc'd yet more, if that were now so proper, from their having been, with the express licence of God, admitted to *circumcision*, which was such a stipulation also. If it be yet farther repli'd, that then they may be oblig'd by their own virtual promise, but not by what their Godfathers promise in their name: I answer, that, as what their Godfathers promise in their name is the same in effect with what they themselves are suppos'd to do; so, the Godfathers being but the mouth of their respective Pupils, it is the same in reputation of Law, and in the common estimate of the World. And I have in my own thoughts resembled it to what a man promiseth by an Interpreter, or rather, to what a dumb man doth by one that hath the faculty of speaking, especially if he speak in his name and person. For as there the promise that is made is not reckoned as the speakers, but his whose Interpreter or mouth he is (the Speaker having no other interest in it than the *notifying* it to those that are concern'd in it, which a *machine* ingeniously contriv'd may be made to do) so the Baptismal promise, though uttered by the Godfathers, is not theirs who so utter it, but his whose mouth and interpreters they are. Whence it was, that, as at present the Godfathers are both interrogated and make answer in the name and person of that Child for whom they appear; so heretofore, which made it yet more manifest, the Interrogatories were put to the Child it self, and the Answer that proceeded from the Godfathers interpreted as coming from it. All which things, as they tend to shew the promise to be the Childs, and not those persons by whom it is notified, so do therefore perswade the obligation thereof to be his also, neither can he avoid to believe and do according as those his Godfathers made answer for him.

It appearing from the premises, that Children are bound to believe and do as their Godfathers promis'd for them, or rather, as they themselves promis'd by them, it is not at all to be wondred that the Catechism should prompt them to add, that *by Gods help so they will*. For indeed their will is bound already, neither can they, after so solemn a promise, entertain any thought, either of believing or acting contrary thereto. For whatever liberty there might otherwise be to the parties concern'd, there is not now any shadow of liberty remaining, and they both may and ought to look upon themselves as bound so much the faster, because they have bound themselves. Though even in that bondage (as the Catechism doth immediately suggest) there is perfect freedom, and for which they have more reason to *thank* their *heavenly father*, than to repent themselves. For this seeming bondage is a *state of salvation*, and God who hath *called* them to and brought them into it, hath also, because he hath made it a salutary Sacrament, called them to the adoption of Sons, and the portion of Heirs, as in fine, to whatever either happiness or privilege the immediate Institutor thereof hath purchased for them. And happy they who are thus advantageously bound, who are thus prevented, not from a better choice (for that is impossible for them to make) but from any destructive one. Let them take care, as is but reasonable, to preserve this bond inviolable, let them abide by their own promises, and  
see



see to the due observation of them : Lastly, let them *continue unto their lives* end in that observance, and, that they may be sure to do so, beg of God the farther assistance of his *grace*. For as it is evident enough from Christianity, that he, who hath call'd us to this state of Salvation, must also preserve us in it; so it is no less evident, that, if we depart from our own promises, we shall be forced to let go all pretensions to the other: He who violates his own part in any Covenant, casting the obligation of him with whom he makes it, because destroying that bond by which he was tied to him.

Now though the Account I have already given of this Proemial part of our Church-Catechism be commensurate to all those things which it gives us occasion to enquire into, and particularly concerning Godfathers and Godmothers; yet because those spiritual Parents for the most part have as much need of Instruction as their Pupils, and the natural Parents as either, to make my Discourse so much the more advantageous, as well as more compleat, I will shew the former to what care they are oblig'd, as the latter what persons they ought to make choice of to discharge it.

It was long since observ'd by the Judicious *Hooker*, that among some kind of men these spiritual Parents had the name of *Witnesses*, as if they came but to see and testify what is done. And certainly, as the matter is now managed, they are no more in effect; so little regard is afterwards had to those for whom they appear. But as, in the judgment of the same learned man, it favours more of piety to continue to them their old name of Fathers and Mothers in God; so there is enough in what they do to justify the title, and persuade them to answer it in their care. For doth not the Church receive Infants to Baptism upon their motion and tender, even to that Baptism, which, as the Scripture speaks, is the *laver of regeneration*? And may not those therefore, by whose means they are so begotten again, very well deserve that title, nay ought they not to shew themselves such by their careful education of them? for can any Parent satisfy his duty by the only begetting of his Children, nay doth not that very begetting draw after it another and a greater care? Would not their very begetting otherwise be rather an injury than a benefit, because helping them to a being, without which they could not have been miserable? The case is the same as to those spiritual Parents and their Children; nay the inconvenience that attends their neglect, is by so much the greater, by how much the greater evil it is, to be miserable in the other World, than in this. For if that Baptismal profession be not answer'd by a suitable conversation, it rather damns than saves, and the sin of those whose spiritual Parents they are, is so much the more sinful, because it is also a breach of so sacred a Vow as that of Baptism is. Now I demand at whose door shall this great guilt lie? Not altogether to be sure, nor yet mostly at the *Childs*; because, where there wants a due education, no other can well be expected, than a life no way suitable to so holy a profession. Shall we then lay it at the *Parents*? There, no doubt, a great part of it will, as for other reasons, so for this, because they had the greatest opportunities to instruct them better. But that either all, or so much of it should, as to leave little or nothing to the *God-fathers*, is unreasonable to think, considering how far they interpose themselves. For upon whose motion but theirs was it, that the Child was admitted to Baptism? Who, but they, tender'd it at the Font, answer'd for it, or impos'd its name? These, I trow, are shrewd presumptions; that

that there belong'd to them more of Parents than the name, yea that they were not without a portion of their both Authority and care. Sure I am, the very imposing of names was heretofore an ensign of Authority, and as sure, because Authority was ordain'd for the benefit of those over whom it was to be exercised, that it cannot be any where without a proportionable burden of care attending on it. And though that be an argument of an inferiour nature, and rather an accessory than a principal, yet I think it not to be despis'd, that both God and the Church (as was before intimated) doth at their instance confer upon Children the great grace of Baptism, and ought therefore in *gratitude* to be requited by a careful education of them; especially, when this is otherwise owing to God and the Church by them, as being more or less the duty of all persons in their several circumstances to concern themselves in the eternal welfare of their brethren.

To address my self now to those to whom the choice of Godfathers and Godmothers appertaineth, and who therefore, if they make an ill one, may oftentimes thank themselves. Where first of all, I cannot but take notice of a common fault that prevails in the World, even the making choice of such persons especially from whom they hope for some temporal advantage to their Children. For beside that this is wholly extrinsecal to the office of a Surety in Baptism; the persons, that look after that, shew but too plainly that they have not much regard to their eternal welfare, the promoting whereof would be a far greater boon to them than any earthly advantage whatsoever. And though that also may be sometime provided for in the making choice of the richer sort for that office, because these are better able than others to bestow a good education upon them; yet generally such men think they have satisfied their duty (because the Parents chief expectation) when they have bestow'd a piece of money upon them, or given them a Porrendish or a silver Spoon, and the Child in strict speaking is as much without Godfathers and Godmothers as if it had none at all. If such things as these be look'd after, in Gods name let it be in its due place, and after the Kingdom of God and its righteousness, into which Kingdom it is the design of Baptism to enter men, and not into the possession of any earthly emolument. Now the best way to provide for that, will be for Parents to make choice of such persons as *live near them*, or are otherwise well *acquainted with* or *related to* them, persons of *age* and *understanding*, of an *orderly and pious conversation*. That the first of these is but requisite, a little reason will teach them, if they will but make use of it. For what great likelihood is there of their taking care of their Children's Education, who live far from them, and it may be shall never see them more; who bring them to the Font to be received into the Church, and leave them there when they have done? And it brings to my mind what Job \* tells us of the Ostrich, *which leaveth her eggs in the earth, and warmeth them in the dust, forgetting that the foot may crush them, or the wild beast may break them. She is hardned against her young ones as though they were not hers, her labour is in vain without fear.* For such in truth are those Godfathers and Godmothers before spoken of. After they have given these their spiritual Children a new birth, they take no farther care of them, nor are at all solicitous what may become of them. The foot may crush them, or the wild beast may break them, yea that *roaring lion*, who goes about seeking whom he may devour, may. Though setting aside that danger, there wants not that which may recommend

\* Job 39. 14.  
&c.

commend unto Parents the choice of those of their own relation or acquaintance, but especially of those of their own neighbourhood. For as that would be a good means to promote amity and all good offices among them by reason of their mutual obligation to each other; so that would endear them so much the more to their Lord and Master Christ, who requireth nothing more of his Disciples than love and kindness to each other. I will not say much of the Parents making choice of such also as are of age and understanding, and not, as it sometime happens, of those who are but Children themselves: The choice of these latter, as it is but a mockery of God and the Church, so being more suitable to that age wherein Children were also permitted to assume the *Rochet*, and play the Fools in the *Episcopal* Office. The only thing to be accounted for, is their taking care that these Sureties be persons of an orderly Conversation, which yet will require no great pains to establish. For what great hopes can the Congregation have, nay what hopes can the Parents themselves have, that those shall be helpers with them in the education of their Children, who have no care of their own Souls? Or that they should put them in mind of the Vow they made in Baptism, when they are so apt to forget their own? But when the persons they make choice of for so weighty a purpose are religious and holy, when they understand the office they take upon them; and have opportunity by reason of their neighbourhood to them, or acquaintance with them to perform it, they may then hope; yea be confident, that they will be helpers with them in admonishing their Children whilst they live, and, in case they die, perform the office of a Father to them. If (as cannot now be well expected when the Office is so generally detested) if, I say, persons altogether so qualified cannot be provided, yet let it be the Parents infelicity rather than their fault; and let them themselves supply by their own personal care what is thus likely to be wanting in the other. And let those few also, who are so qualified, see to their respective charges, and both cause them to be instructed in that Religion to which they were admitted, and admonish them of that solemn Vow they made by them to observe it. So shall they endear this excellent institution of Godfathers and Godmothers to those who now despise it, so shall they also discharge their own great and important trust; and be a means to bring those their Children into the Kingdom of Heaven as well as into the bosom of the Church.





AN  
EXPLICATION  
OF THE  
APOSTLES CREED,

As it is a Part of and Interpreted

BY THE  
CATECHISM  
OF THE  
Church of England,

Together with

An *INTRODUCTION* thereto,

THE NATIONAL

DEPT. OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

THE NATIONAL

OF THE

THE NATIONAL

THE NATIONAL



# AN INTRODUCTION TO THE EXPLICATION OF THE APOSTLES CREED.

## The Contents.

*An inquiry into the nature of that belief which the Creed requires, as also into the general nature of the Articles thereof. Touching the former is shewn, that it is a firm but inevident perswasion of the mind, whether founded in reason, as that concerning the being and general nature of God is, or upon testimony, as that concerning the other Articles of the Creed is. The latter of these Beliefs more particularly examin'd, and accordingly inquiry made, Upon what testimony it ought to found it self, How that testimony may appear to us, Of what force such a testimony is to support that belief which is founded on it, and How that belief is to be adapted to the several Articles of the Creed. A transition from the nature of the Belief requir'd to that of the Articles thereof; where again enquiry is made Whether they contain in them the whole of the Christian Faith, or at least of what is generally necessary to be believ'd, as also whether or no and how far the present Collection of them be to be look'd upon as the work of the Apostles.*

**T**HE Catechism having given an account of what we promised to renounce, and so superseded any farther inquiry concerning that first part of our Baptismal profession, proceeds in this place to inquire concerning the *Articles of that faith* which we did in the second place oblige our selves to believe. Which, as they are therefore to come next under our consideration, who propose an orderly explication of it; so, that I may do it with the greater advantage, I will here premise something concerning the *Belief* exacted, and then concerning *those things* which it is to receive into its Assent.

For the understanding the former, whereof we are to know, that as the mind of man is naturally dispos'd to assent to or own any thing as a truth, which may by any means approve it self to be such, so it is brought to that Assent, either by its own apprehensions of the nature of the thing it self, or by the testimony of those who may be supposed to have an

Catechist. Re-  
hearse the Arti-  
cles of thy Be-  
lief.

Answer. I be-  
lieve in God the  
Father, &c.

apprehension of it. If its Assent be produced by the former, so it may again be different, according to the diversity of its apprehensions. For, if those apprehensions be full and clear, its Assent is then certain and unavoidable, and hath the name of Science or knowledge. If they be imperfect or obscure, its Assent is not without fear of being deceiv'd, though that again less or more, as it seems to it self to have approached nearer to, or to be farther removed from a due apprehension of it. For, if it seems to it self to have attain'd a competent apprehension of it, its Assent, though not without a fear of error, may yet be firm and stable, because the grounds of that fear are no way equal to those which incline the mind to assent to it. Now each of these Assents hath the name of Opinion, though not seldom also of Belief. For though (as I shall by and by shew) that be most properly the name of another kind of Assent, yet it is frequently used of all such, as have not the evidence of knowledge, from whence soever they proceed. But because the mind of man cannot learn all truths by it self, nor, many of those it can, without great difficulty; therefore, to comply with its innate desire of truth, as well as with its own ease, it seeks out for information from those who may be supposed to have an apprehension of it. Only, as fidelity is as requisite in a witness as knowledge, it takes care that those it seeks to, be as well qualified for truth in the delivery, as they are for their apprehension of the thing they do. But that being once ascertain'd to it, the mind of man doth without more ado rely upon their testimony, and assent thereupon to what they deliver, proportionably to that evidence which she hath of their fidelity and knowledge. But then if it find out one who is truth and wisdom it self, and who therefore cannot be suppos'd either to deceive us or be deceiv'd himself, so far as his testimony can appear, it doth yet more strongly assent to it, and to that which is delivered upon it. For if that testimony do immediately appear to it, its assent is then infallible, it is like that which we give to first principles, or to the clear and evident testimony of our own senses: But if otherwise, provided it be by such ways and means as admit not of any reasonable cause of doubting, yet without any thing of hesitation; and the mind of man, though not infallible in its assent, is yet certain and resolute, because despising all those fears which a bare possibility of being deceiv'd may be suppos'd to incumber it withal.

Now though Belief in its most proper signification, be such an Assent as we but now describ'd, that is to say, an Assent to the truth of any thing, upon the testimony of him, by whom it is propos'd to be believ'd; though such a Belief (as hath been elsewhere \* shewn) be due from us to all those Articles of Faith which are properly and purely Christian: yet, as the word is not seldom taken for any inevident persuasion of the mind, from whence soever that persuasion may arise; so I conceive that in the Creed it ought to be taken in that laxer sense, or at least not so rigorously interpreted as to exclude it. For is not the Being of God the first and principal Article of our Belief, is it not the foundation of our Creed, as well as of all other religious persuasions? And ought not that therefore to have a share in that Belief which we profess, nay ought it not, considering the place it hath in our Creed, to be the first and principal object of it? Now what Belief properly so call'd can any man have concerning the Being of God, what testimony can any man have to build so important a persuasion on? Shall he ground it upon the testimony of God? But he must first know that there is one, and, in some measure also,

\* *Explic. of the Decal. Com. 1. Part. 2.*

also, that he is such an one as is worthy of his belief. Shall he ground it upon the testimony of Men? But beside that that is too sandy a foundation to build such a persuasion on, we our selves make profession of believing in God and not in men, and ought therefore to look out for a more assured one. Now forasmuch as the Being of God is both the first and principal object of our Belief, forasmuch as it neither hath, nor can have, any sufficient testimony to build it on; neither can that Belief which we are suppos'd to have of it, be any Belief properly so call'd, nor that therefore which the Creed requires concerning it, any other than a firm persuasion of the mind, from whence soever that persuasion may arise. The same is to be said in some measure as to Gods nature as well as Being, to his giving Being to the World, and watching over it by his Providence. For what place can there be, either for Gods testimony, or our Belief upon it, till we be some-way assur'd of his truth? Or how suppose he will not suffer us to be impos'd upon, till we be first in some measure persuaded of our own being the workmanship of his hands, and so under the conduct of his Providence? Only as amidst the things of God many cannot be known but by Revelation, and others but obscurely and imperfectly, and consequently may so far forth become the object both of the Divine testimony and of our belief upon it; so all the following Articles of our Creed are resolv'd into the testimony of him, by whom they are propos'd to be believ'd. For which cause, though that more general notion of Belief be not altogether to be excluded, yet we are especially to understand such a one as is founded upon the testimony of him, in whom we here profess to believe.

Now there are four things to be inquir'd concerning that Belief, which we have affirmed to be especially intended.

1. Upon what testimony it ought to found it self.
2. How that testimony may appear to us.
3. Of what force such a testimony is to support that Belief which is founded on it.
4. How that Belief is to be adapted to the several Articles propos'd.

1. As to the first of these much need not be said to him, who considers the pretences of that doctrine; the Articles whereof we are to receive into our belief. For pretending to be a doctrine not of men but of God, he, who receives it upon any testimony less than that of God, doth rather dishonour than embrace it, because owning it not in that which is the greatest commendation of it.

2. As little need to be said in the general (for the particular probation thereof I reserve to another place) to shew how that divine testimony may appear to us. For that testimony whereof we speak being notified to the World, by those Miracles which our Saviour first, and after him his Apostles wrought; as those Miracles again by the writings of the Apostles, and both by the general, and constant, and undaunted profession of those who entertain'd it; No doubt at all can remain to us of its being witness'd to by God, and, as such, of its being to be believ'd and embrac'd. For if we yield our Assent, nay cannot but yield it, where the things that are reported are avow'd by those against whose knowledge or integrity we have no just exception; how much more then when the thing in controversy is owned by so many and for so many ages, yea owned by them in fact as well as in words, as that again when the profession thereof tended to their extrem peril, and did not seldom involve them



them in the greatest temporal evils? Neither will it avail to say, with what earnestness soever it is inculcated, that our Faith by this means will become human and fallible. For neither is our Faith in strict speaking resolv'd into a human testimony, neither is it any prejudice thereto, that it is some-way human and fallible, provided it be also free from the suspicion of any actual error. That our Faith is not hereby resolv'd into a human testimony is evident from hence, that the testimony of men is not made the ground of our belief (for we our selves believe it upon the credit of those divine Miracles, by which it was at first recommended to the World) but only us'd as a means to assure us of the being of those Miracles, by which we affirm it to have been established. And it may not unfitly be exemplified by the belief of those men, who, upon seeing what was done by our Lord and his Apostles, were induced to embrace the Christian Faith. For as there it was the Miracles that were wrought that was the ground of their belief, and not the testimony of their eyes; the testimony of their eyes serving only to assure them of those Miracles upon which they did so rely: So they are the same Miracles here, and not the testimony of men, which is the ground of that assent, which we, who live at that distance from them, yield to the Christian Faith; That testimony serving only to convey the notice of those Miracles, upon which it was recommended to the World. If it be farther repli'd, that the admitting of such a testimony under what notion soever, will make our Faith so far forth human and fallible; As I shall not be backward to acknowledge the truth of the suggestion, so neither to affirm that it is no prejudice to our Faith, provided it be also free from the suspicion of any actual error. For, that suppos'd, what prejudice can it be to our Faith, either as to the *firmness of its adhesion*, which is one of the things to be fear'd, or as to *its acceptance with God*, which is the other? for will no Faith less than infallible make men resolute and stable, nay doth not a far less Faith than that govern the World, and all the actions of it? Do not men, upon a belief of being some-way advantag'd by it, sail, marry, get Children, and cast their Corn into the ground? When yet (as *Origen* \* observes) the contrary may happen, nay when, as the same Father observes, they themselves see the contrary sometime doth? Do they not upon the like belief venture upon many other hazardous and contingent enterprizes, do they not do so, when there is no need of it, as well as when there is? These, I suppose, are sufficient indications that a Faith that is human and fallible, may make men firm and resolute: How much more then such a Faith as is not only founded upon a divine testimony, but hath thing of human or fallible in it, but the ministry of those by which the notice of the other is convey'd? And though an infallible Faith is also urg'd by some men, as less than which cannot be suppos'd to find acceptance with God; yet as they should do well to alledge better arguments than have been yet produc'd, to shew the necessity thereof; so they should do well in the mean time to consider, what account is to be given of our Saviour pronouncing those more especially blessed, who believe without the sight of those Miracles which were wrought by or on him: Those words of his being a sufficient intimation that they had not so forcible motives to induce them to believe, and therefore much less to produce that infallible Assent whereof they speak. But so also should they do well to consider, and which is indeed the cause of my dwelling so long upon it, what may be thought to become of the generality of believers, and whose Faith seems to be as strong and as efficacious as that of wiser men;

\* Contra Cels. li. i. pag. 10. ed. Cant. Τίς γὰρ πλὴν, ἢ γὰρ μὴ, ἢ παρομοιάται, ἢ ῥίπτει τὰ σπέρματα ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, μὴ τὰ κρεῖττονα πιστεύων ἀπαυτῆσθαι, δυνατὸν ὄντων καὶ τὸ ἐναντία γενέσθαι, καὶ ἔστιν ὅτε γινώσκουσιν ὅτι τὰ κρεῖττονα καὶ τὰ κατ' εὐχὴν ἀπαυτῆσθαι πῶς τοιαῦτα ποιεῖ καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἀδύνατα καὶ δύνατα ἀλλοὺς συμβῆναι.

men; there being presumptions enough of their believing upon very insufficient motives, and how much less then upon infallible ones?

3. Now as after I have thus shewn how the divine testimony may appear to us, it may seem but seasonable to inquire of what force such a testimony is to support that belief which is founded on it; so I should not be backward to comply with the invitation, but that I am as yet in quest of the Being of him whose testimony it is, and of the several perfections of his nature. But because that is in reason to precede the consideration of the other, as without which we can have no assurance, either of his testimony or the forcibleness thereof; I shall content my self at present to observe from that notion which all men have of God, that he is of so great wisdom as not to be capable of being deceiv'd himself, and of so great integrity, as well as goodness, as not to be capable of deceiving us. Which as they are sufficient to engage the Assent of any to whom this testimony shall appear, so they cannot well fail to engage ours, because we have the common sense of Christendom to warrant it, and our believing the Doctrine of Christianity upon it.

4. A tolerable account being now given of the Belief that is here requir'd, and to which nothing may seem necessary to be added, but its propriety to the dispensation of the Gospel, and the reason of Gods choice thereof for it, of which I have elsewhere \* discours'd at large; it will be but reasonable to make my approach toward the consideration of those Articles which are propos'd to be embrac'd by it. Only, because those Articles of our Belief are of different natures, it will be but just, before we descend to that, to shew how this belief of ours is to be accommodated thereto.

\* Explic. of the  
Dec. Com. 1.  
Part 2.

There are who have thought, that, because the Particle *in* is added to our Belief of God the Father, his only Son and the Holy Ghost, we are to understand, so far as they are concern'd in this belief, a Belief with Affiance, the so believing of them as also to put our trust in them. And indeed as that Phrase is now mostly so us'd, so there is no doubt, such is the duty of all those who are initiated into our most excellent Religion. But beside that where matters of belief are pretended to be declar'd, it is more reasonable to suppose a simple belief intended, than a belief with all its due qualifications or effects; neither is there any thing in that Particle, which is so much insisted on, to determine it to any other belief than a simple and naked one. Witness, to omit other arguments, the same † or other Creeds applying that Phrase of *believing in* to other Articles as well as those, and where therefore such an affiance cannot be suppos'd to be either required or intended. Now as it will follow from thence, that there is no difference as to this particular in the accommodating of our Belief to the several Articles propos'd, and consequently that we have no reason to understand any other belief than a simple and naked one; So, a simple belief being nothing else than the owning the truth of that which is propos'd as the object of it, the manner of its accommodation is in reason to be taken from the nature of the thing it self, or the manner in which it is propos'd to be believ'd. Thus for instance, because God, who is the prime object of our belief, is manifestly a substance, and what follows after the mention of him only Attributes thereof; we are consequently to understand, because there can be no other rational inquiry concerning a substance simply considered, but concerning its existence, we are to understand, I say, by *believing in God* that there is such a thing as we call God, as by *Father Almighty, maker of heaven*  
and

† Vid. Pearson  
on the Creed.

*and earth*, that God hath the relation of a Father, that he is Almighty, and did sometime make Heaven and Earth. In like manner, because though God be in many respects a *father*, yet it is manifest from what follows concerning Jesus Christ *his only Son*, that that paternity of God's is propos'd with relation to him, we are therefore to understand our selves directed by that appellation to believe that that God is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, because in that sense and no other he is here propos'd to us as a Father. The same is to be said concerning that second great Article of our Faith, even that which respects our blessed Lord and Saviour. For because the name of *Jesus*, though not without a mysterious signification, is known from story to have been the name of a person, as that of *Christ* and *Lord* of a dignity or office; therefore by believing in Jesus must be also meant that there was such a person, as by Christ and Lord, that he was the Anointed one of God, even he who had been of old foretold, and the Lord both of us and of all mankind. By the help of these two considerations may any man, that is but tolerably observant, adapt the belief that is here requir'd to those Articles of the Creed that follow: And therefore instead of intending it any longer, I will address my self to the consideration of those Articles, to which this belief of ours is to be adapted.

Now there are two things to be inquir'd concerning those Articles to which our Belief is here requir'd.

1. Whether they contain in them the whole of the Christian Faith, or at least of what is generally necessary to be believ'd?
2. Whether this Collection of them be to be look'd upon as the work of the Apostles, or rather, after their time made by others out of their writings or preachings, and so transmitted to posterity?

I. That the foremention'd Articles contain in them the whole of the Christian Faith, or at least of what is generally necessary to be believ'd, is so clearly the doctrine of the Church of *England* in this Catechism of hers, that he must be strangely blind who doth not see it, and as strangely perverse who will not acknowledge it. For beside that she exacts no other Faith than this of those whom she admits to Baptism, which she her self declares to be a *state* of Salvation; beside that she proposeth no other than this to those whom she takes upon her to instruct, and so bring both to Confirmation and a more intimate communion with her; In that Answer which she puts into the Catechumens mouth concerning the promise that was made for him in Baptism, she puts it out of all doubt: Because prompting him to say, that his Sureties promis'd for him that he should believe all the Articles of the Christian Faith, when it is apparent by her own form of Baptism, that she exacted no other profession of them, than of believing those Articles whereof we speak, and which we are now making way to the Explication of. Neither will it avail to say, that she her self hath other Creeds, and one whereof is a constant attendant of every Lords Day Service. For as it is not the words but the sense of the Creed, which ought to be look'd upon both as its doctrine and the object of our belief; So the question is not whether those other Creeds contain any thing else in them than what is virtually contain'd in this. Which that they do not, the Church of *England* will no doubt averr, and I, who undertake an Explication of her doctrine, will in due place endeavour to maintain. But because whatever the Church of *England* may assert, yet neither doth she her self profess to believe without grounds,





to have attributed the Creed unto the Apostles. For neither doth it so agree with that Creed which he delivers; no not in those particulars, wherein, so far as we can guess by him, or by other Ancient Copies of the Creed, it agreed with that ancient Roman one, which he affirms to be purely and perfectly Apostolical.

But so also may it appear from the same *Ruffinus*, that the Creed, as we now have it, is not the work of the Apostles, as to all the Articles therein contain'd. For besides that there is no mention in *his* of the *Communion of Saints*, or *Life everlasting*, which are distinct Articles of ours; it is the distinct affirmation of the same *Ruffinus*, that *Christ's descent into hell* had no place in that Ancient Roman Creed which he so much commends, no nor yet in the Eastern ones.

<sup>a</sup> Sciendum sane est quod in Ecclesie Romane Symbolo non habetur additum,

*Descendit ad inferna, sed neq; in Orientis Ecclesiis habetur hic sermo.* Expos. in Symb. Apost.

But because though the Creed be not Apostolical in all its expressions or Articles, yet nothing hinders but it may be so, as to the sense and order too of what it especially proposeth to be believ'd; therefore, if we will proceed clearly and faithfully, we must go on to enquire, whether it be in any measure Apostolical, and wherein, and how far, it may be affirmed so to be: I do not mean, as to the doctrine therein contain'd (for of that there is not the least doubt) but as that doctrine is made a part of our Creed, and obliged to be professed by those who will enter themselves into Christianity. For the resolution whereof I will shew,

1. That there was from the beginning a certain Summary of Faith to be profess'd by the Baptiz'd, and which, though not delivered always in the same words, yet was to the same effect, and much what in the same order.
2. That this Summary was of the Apostles Institution.
3. That our Creed, as to what concerns the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is the same in effect with it, and probably also as to some other Articles.

1. That there was from the beginning a certain *Summary of Faith* to be profess'd by the Baptized persons, and which, though not delivered always in the same numerical words, yet was to the same effect, and much what in the same order, there are many things to perswade, and such as considered altogether will leave no place of doubt concerning it. For beside that Baptism is in its own nature a stipulation, and particularly of the belief of the Christian Faith, to enable men for which it was but necessary they should have at hand some short confession of Faith to teach them, and, for the preservation of unity, an uniform one; Beside that, it is apparent from *Justin Martyr*<sup>b</sup>, one of the Ancientest Writers the Christian Church hath, that the Church before she baptiz'd men was assur'd of their believing what she taught, and from *Irenaeus*<sup>c</sup>, that there was delivered to them in Baptism an immovable Rule of truth, and by which he prompts his Readers to judge of the evil inferences the Hereticks made from several expressions of the Scripture: What account can otherwise be given of that general agreement there is between the Creeds of several Churches as to what is deliver'd concerning the several persons of the Trinity, which are the prime Articles of our belief? For setting aside *Christ's descent into hell*, and which *Ruffinus* assures us to have been peculiar to the Church of *Aquileia*; there is little or no difference between them as to those particulars, as he who will compare the several Creeds in Bishop *Ushers* Tract *de Symbolis*, will find himself obliged to

<sup>b</sup> Οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ δὲ  
δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ  
ἐκείνῳ ἀληθὲς  
ταῦτα τὰ ὑπὸ  
ἡμῶν διδασ-  
κόμενα καὶ ὡς  
γόμενα ὅτι --  
ἀληθὲς ὡς  
ἡμῶν ἔστι καὶ  
ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ. A-  
pol. 2. p. 93.  
<sup>c</sup> Adv. haercl.  
li. 1. c. 1. §. 10  
ὅτι καὶ ἐν τῷ  
καθάρῳ τῆς  
ἀληθείας δι-  
κλινῇ ἐν ἑαυ-  
τῷ κατέχων,  
ὅτι διὰ τὴν βα-  
πτισματικὴν ἑλπίδα, τὰ μὲν ἐν τῇ γενεῇ ὁ νόμος ἐπιγινώσκεται, &c.

confess

confels. Unless perhaps it may be thought such, that in some of the Ancient Creeds there is no mention as to the *father* of his being the *maker of heaven and earth*. But beside that even that Article is in the Ancient Creeds of *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*; it may seem, as to the force of it, to have been in those Creeds which make no particular mention of it: The term of *Almighty* as we learn from *Ruffinus*<sup>d</sup>, denoting that *dominion* of his over all things, which ariseth from the Creation of them. And though it be also true, and by me therefore willingly acknowledg'd, that there wanted not general reasons to perswade the espousing of that form in which the several Creeds appear, such as are the natural order wherein those divine persons stand, the place they have in the prescribed form of Baptism, and the as natural order of those things which are there predicated of our Saviour: yet as those reasons do rather perswade than enforce that order, and much less enforce so naked an account of that which is affirmed either to have hapned to, or been done by our Saviour; so it is not easy nor indeed possible to conceive they should have so conspir'd in both, were it not that this pattern was set them at the beginning by those who were the common founders of the Church: It being easy to see, by what our own experience suggests, that, where men think themselves at liberty to follow wholly the conduct of their own fancies, their confessions of Faith are not only strangely different from this, but as strangely different from one another.

<sup>d</sup> *Omnipotens autem ab eo dicitur, quod omnium tenet potentatum. Expos. in Symb. Ap.*

2. But from hence it will also follow (which was the second thing to be prov'd) that this summary whereof we speak was of the Apostles own Institution: What may appear to have been from the beginning and not directly commanded in Scripture, necessarily resolving it self into the Institution of those who were the first founders of the Church. And indeed as we are not lightly to esteem the several testimonies that offer themselves for the compiling of the Creed by the Apostles (for *Ruffinus* is not the only man<sup>e</sup> that hath affirm'd it) so supposing what hath been before said, a fair account may be given both of its pretence to an Apostolical Institution, and of that variation which occurs either in the Articles or expressions of it: Of the former, because shewing it as to its first framing, principal Articles, and order, to have been from the Apostles; of the latter, because leaving place for variety of expressions, as to which the Apostles tyed not themselves, and for the addition of other whether deductions or explications of them, as the emergency of affairs should require.

<sup>e</sup> See for the proof of this the testimonies both of *Irenæus* and *Tertullian* afterwards alledged. *Epiph. sub finem Anchorati. "Αὐτοὺς μὲν ἡ πίστις (ubi de Symbolo Nicæno loquitur) παραδεδόκη*

ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγίων Ἀποστόλων. ἣν ἐκκλησία τῇ ἀγίᾳ πόλει ἀπὸ πάντων ἐμῶν τῶν ἀγίων Ἐπισκόπων ἵσως ταύτης οἰνὸν δέκα ἔδειξάν prescripta. Vid. & *Hieron. in Epist. ad Pammachium, apud Usser. de Symbolis.*

3. Now though from what hath been said it do also competently appear, that our Creed, as to what concerns the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is the same in effect with that Summary of Faith before spoken of, which is the former part of that which comes now in the third place to be shewn; yet to make it yet farther evident, and because I have hitherto given no other account of it, than may be suppos'd to be collected from the general agreement there was so far between the several Creeds of the ancient Church, therefore I will now from what Antiquity will afford give a more direct account of that Summary, only desiring of my Reader, as I go, to carry his Creed in mind, that so he may the better discern the agreement that is between them. That of *Irenæus* before refer'd to shall lead the way, as because of the Antiquity of the man, so because he there professeth to give an account of the Faith of the Univer-





ing. Which Summaries of Faith, so far as they go, who sees not how well ours corresponds with, or rather (for so it is in truth) is the same in effect with them? To the testimonies of *Irenæus*, subjoin we those of *Tertullian*, where he speaks of the same Rule of truth, and which he expressly stiles the *Rule of Faith*. For though in that place, to which I shall first refer, he doth not ascribe it to the Apostles, yet in his Book *de Præscriptione hæreticorum*, and *fourteenth Chapter* he affirms it to have been <sup>b</sup> *instituted by Christ*, and proves it afterwards to be such in the *twentieth Chapter* of the same, because *delivered* <sup>i</sup> *by his Apostles* to the Church. Thus therefore he in his Book *de Velandis Virginibus*, and *first Chapter*. The Rule <sup>k</sup> of faith is one only *immoveable and irreformable*, to wit of believing in one God Almighty maker of the world, and in his Son Jesus Christ born of the Virgin Mary, crucified under Pontius Pilate, the third day raised from the dead, received up into heaven, now sitting at the right hand of the father, from whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead by the resurrection also of the flesh. And in the *thirteenth Chapter* of his book *de Præscriptione hæreticorum*, where he also gives an Account of the same Rule of faith, after the mention of that Article of Christ's sitting at the right hand of God, he addes <sup>l</sup>, that he sent his deputy the Holy Ghost to aduate believers, and that he himself shall come with glory to take the Saints into the possession of eternal life, and adjudge the profane to everlasting fire, both of them being restor'd to their former circumstances by the resurrection of the flesh. Though if any man desire a yet farther proof concerning the belief of the Holy Ghost's being a part of that Rule of Faith whereof he speaks, he may not only be assured of it by the *second Chapter* of his Book against *Præceas*, where in the close of the Rule there recited by him, he affirms <sup>m</sup>, that Christ sent from the father the Holy Ghost the comforter to be the *sanctifier of those who believe in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*, but also from the *sixth Chapter* of his Book *de Baptismo* <sup>n</sup>, where he not only affirms the faith of the Baptized person to be sealed in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, whom he also calls *Arbiters of their faith*, and *sponsors of their salvation*, but takes notice also of the Church having a part in that Faith, because she is as it were the *body of the three*. All which whosoever shall consider, will not only not be at a loss for the truly Catholick and Apostolick Summary of Faith, as of which there are so many expresses in the testimonies before remembred, but be easily induced to believe, that, so far as concerns the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost at least, the Creed, that we now have, is the same in effect with it.

<sup>b</sup> Hec regula à Christo, ut probabitur, instituta nullas habet apud nos questiones, &c.

<sup>i</sup> Statim igitur Apostoli --- primo per Judeam contestatâ fide in Jesum Christum & Ecclesiis institutis, dehinc in orbem profecti eandem doctrinam ejusdem fidei Nationibus promulgaverunt, & proinde Ecclesiis apud unamquamque civitatem condiderunt. à quibus traducem fidei & semina doctrinæ, cæteræ exinde Ecclesiæ mutuatae sunt, & quotidie mutantur ut Ecclesiæ fiant.

<sup>k</sup> Regula quidem fidei una omnino est, sola immobilis, & irreformabilis, credendi scilicet in unicum deum omnipotentem mundi conditorem, & filium ejus Jesum Christum natum ex Virgine Maria; crucifixum sub

Pontio Pilato, tertia die resuscitatum à mortuis, receptum in caelis, sedentem nunc ad dexteram Patris, venturum judicare vivos & mortuos, per carnis etiam resurrectionem. <sup>l</sup> — misisse Vicariam vim Spiritus Sancti qui credentes agat: venturum cum claritate ad sumendos Sanctos in Vitæ æternæ & promissorum caelestium fructum, & ad profanos adjudicandos igni perpetuo, factâ utriusque partis resurrectione cum carnis resurrectione. <sup>m</sup> — qui exinde miserit, secundum promissionem suam, à Patre Spiritum Sanctum Paracletum, sanctificatorem fidei eorum, qui credunt in Patrem & Filium & Spiritum Sanctum. <sup>n</sup> Sic enim Johannes ante præcursor Domini fuit, præparans vias ejus: ita & angelus Baptismi arbiter superventuro Spiritui Sancto vias dirigit ablutione delictorum quam fides impetrat, obsignata in Patre & Filio & Spiritu Sancto. Nam si in tribus testibus stabit omne verbum, quanto magis, dum habemus per benedictionem eosdem arbitros fidei quos & sponsores salutis, sufficit ad fiduciam ipsi nostræ etiam numerus nominum divinarum? Quum autem sub tribus & testatio fidei & sponso salutis pignorentur, necessario adjicitur Ecclesiæ mentio: quoniam ubi tres, id est Pater & Filius & Spiritus Sanctus, ibi Ecclesiæ quæ trium corpus est.

But because I have also said, that the Creed, which we now have, is not only the same in effect with that Ancient Summary as to what respects the Trinity, but probably also as to some other Articles; and because, by the Account I have already given of that Ancient Summary of Faith,

Faith, I am now pretty well provided to prove as well as to affirm it, therefore it may not be amiss to address our selves thereto, and so put an end to this Argument. In order whereunto, it may conduce not a little to observe, that we are not presently to conclude from the omission of this or that Article in Ancient Writers, that therefore it had no place in their Creed. For beside, that they do not oftentimes intend a strict and perfect rehearsal of it, and at other times take notice only of so much as was for their present purpose, leaving the rest to be understood by the known and general practice of the Church; it is manifest from those Accounts which *Irenæus* and *Tertullian* give of it, that they sometimes omitted one thing and sometimes another, which yet it is apparent it was not their design to exclude, because in other places as carefully remembering it. For thus, though *Irenæus* in his second, and *Tertullian* in that *de velandis Virginibus*, take no notice of that Article which respects the *Holy Ghost*, yet each of them do elsewhere give a sufficient account of it, and thereby plainly shew that it was not their design to have it excluded. From whence as it will follow secondly, that, to shew a thing not to have had a place in the Creed, such a testimony must be produced as may also shew the Author of it to have design'd a strict and perfect rehearsal of it; so, if we stay till that be done, we may long enjoy most of those Articles that follow, however commonly suppos'd to have been superadded to the other. For setting aside the *Communion of Saints*, and that of *Life everlasting*, which last yet, where it was omitted, might be thought to have been sufficiently intimated, either in Christs coming to *judge the quick and the dead*, or the *resurrection of the body*, because a known consequent thereof; It doth not appear by the several Ancient Creeds, which Bishop *Usher* hath with great care and judgment laid together, that any of the other three are wanting. Not that of the *Holy Church* (for we will not contend about the word *Catholick*, though it was in that Creed which was expounded by St. *Cyrril*, as after that in others of the Eastern Church) as because it was in that of *Aquileia* exhibited by *Ruffinus*, in the Ancient Roman Creed and Eastern ones (for otherwise it is likely he would have taken notice of it, as he did of other variations of the Aquileian Creed from them) so also, because *Tertullian* remembers it in his tract *de Baptismo*, though he doth not in other places of his works. But neither will there be any fear of losing that concerning *remission of sins*, though neither *Irenæus* nor *Tertullian* take express notice of it in their several formula's. For beside that Baptism was particularly intended for remission of sins, and therefore either that Article not omitted, or omitted only because men did by their very coming to Baptism acknowledge it; as it had a place in those Creeds taken notice of by *Ruffinus*, with which, as to this particular as well as others, several others pointed at by Bishop *Usher* do agree, so it is remembered by St. \* *Cyprian* as one of the Interrogatories that was put in Baptism, as it should seem also, where he was; that concerning *Life everlasting* also. Sure I am the *resurrection of the body* cannot upon any pretence be excluded, as because no Ancient Creed can be produc'd where it is wanting, so *Irenæus* and *Tertullian* both take particular notice of it in their Rules of Faith, and so take away all doubt concerning it. Such presumptions there are for the Articles but now remembered having been a portion of that Summary of Faith which was from the beginning in the Church: And if so, our own will be so far Apostolical also, because according with it in those particulars. Only as it is not my intention to contend with any man about this matter,

\* Cyprian. ad Januar. & ceteros Episcopos Numidas. Sed & ipsa interrogatio que fit in Baptismo, testis est veritatis. Nam cum dicimus: Cre-dis in vitam æternam & remissionem peccatorum per sanctam ecclesiam? Intelligimus remissionem peccatorum non nisi in Ecclesia dari.



matter, provided he will but grant it to have been Apostolical as to its *first framing, principal Articles, and the order of them*; as neither much about that, provided he will pay it that respect, which a Creed of so great Antiquity, and now so generally receiv'd may challenge; so, I will accordingly make it my business, to evince the truth of its respective Articles from other Topicks, and such as it will not be so easy to bring any just exception against.

AN

AN  
 EXPLICATION  
 OF THE  
 APOSTLES CREED,  
 As it is a Part of and Interpreted  
 BY THE  
 CATECHISM  
 OF THE  
 Church of England,

**I believe in God.**

The Contents.

*Of the Being of God, and how necessary it is to establish it. Which may be done by such proofs as are only probable, the force whereof is also remark'd, or by such as are more near to necessary and demonstrative. The Being of a God probably argu'd from the consent of the world concerning it (the exceptions against which are taken off) as also from the force of Conscience in evil men. An address to such proofs as are more near to necessary and demonstrative; where is shewn, That there is an eternal Being, or such as is without beginning of being, That there is such an eternal Being as hath in it all the perfections of being that we are acquainted with, That there is but one such eternal Being, That he giveth being to all other things, And that he upholds and governs them. An answer to what is objected against this last from the present dispensations of the divine providence.*

**I believe  
 in God.**

**T**HE way being thus plain'd to the Explication of that Creed which is to be the subject of the ensuing discourses, pass we on to that Article thereof, which is the foundation of all the rest, and indeed of all that is call'd religions: He that cometh unto God (as the  
 Author

*Author* \* to the Hebrews speaks) being undoubtedly to believe that he is; \* Heb. ii. 6. whatsoever he may be to believe also, that he is a rewarder of those that diligently seek him. Without the former, religion is not only vain, but it is not at all, it is a mere *Chimera* or fiction; it is as idle a thing as the Heathen Poets have made it, or as the Politicians of the world would have it thought to be. For setting that aside, what is there of *holy* or *just*, what tie or obligation to either? The former, as it is no other than a conformity to the Divine nature or will, and therefore supposing the being of *him* to whose nature or will we are to conform; so the latter being founded in the dispensations of his providence, or in the declarations of his will concerning it. For what is there, without God, that any man can call his own, what obligation upon another not to invade it? Is it from the laws of men? But who gave them power to make laws, to set bounds to mens possessions or actions? Nay, their own Empire, if any thing, is an Usurpation upon the world, it is an entrenchment upon the common rights and privileges of mankind; every man naturally being of the same composition and constitution, and carrying the same marks of majesty and grandeur in his face. Since therefore Religion presupposeth the Being of God, since all our obligations to God or Man are founded in it, it is but requisite that *that* should be first established, which I come now with the assistance of that God to enterprize.

Now there are two sorts of Proofs which offer themselves to our consideration, but which seem to me to be alike necessary to be employ'd in this argument; such Proofs I mean, as are only probable and perswasive; or such as are also necessary and demonstrative. For though these latter may seem to supersede the former, according to that known Maxime of the Civil Law, *non prius ad probabile confugiendum est, quam ubi necessarium, id est lex & ratio defecerit*; yet is that to be understood only where men are capable of such strict proofs, and where moreover they are necessary to be had. But as all men have not an ability to comprehend such strict proofs, and therefore neither to give such an assent as is proportionable to them; so it is manifest both from the Scripture and the Creed, that such an assent is not requir'd: Both the one and the other contenting themselves to inculcate, that he who cometh unto God is to believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of such as diligently seek him. Which as it is an assent interior to that of knowledge, and built rather upon probable than necessary arguments; so those arguments, where they are duly weigh'd, may give a sufficient establishment to the mind, they may fix in it the belief of a God, and of that Religion which is superstructed upon it. For will not that which is only probable determine the mind, as well as that which is necessary? Will it not do so much more, where my own interest is concern'd, and where I shall not only rather gain than lose by my belief, but run the hazard of an infinite danger by my omission of it? For what is it that I lose by believing a God, and living answerably to it? What sober pleasure am I depriv'd of, what solid happiness deny'd? On the contrary I have this one great happiness afforded me by it, that I have peace and tranquillity in my own mind, that I am not under the apprehension of any mischief to me by his displeasure; nay am not a little refreshed by the belief and hope of his favour and blessing. On which whilst I reflect, together with the mischief that may accrue to me by my contempt of him, I find my self yet more inclin'd to believe that he is, and to conform my affections and actions to it. Which inclination as it doth yet more fix my assent, so it



supplies that defect which my own want of ratiocination causeth, and I can resist a temptation as well as those who seem most to know him, because I find in my self a willingness to do it. But then if I can also find it probable, that my disbelief will draw after it an eternity of torment, as the avowed doctrine both of Jews and Christians obligeth me to believe, so I shall see yet less reason to listen to the sollicitation of those pleasures, which my bare disbelief or disobedience can be supposed to present me with: Because however those pleasures may seem to claim the precedence as to their certainty, yet the torments which I fear do as far surpass them as to their duration, and such a duration, as, because infinite, no temporary pleasure is able to compensate. Of such force are even probable arguments to establish men in the belief of a God, and of all those other duties which are consequent upon it; and then I hope it will not be thought any way improper to bring those also in view, and establish the belief of a Deity by them.

Now as the measure of probability may in part be taken from the opinion of the World, according to that known definition of *Aristotle*, *Probabile est quod vel omnibus videtur, vel plurimis, vel sapientibus*; so I shall therefore appeal in the first place to that consent which is throughout the world concerning the Being of a God. For let your eyes or your feet turn themselves which way they please, view the Nations themselves, or the several Histories that have been written of them; you shall every where find the belief of a God, you shall find them all paying their adoration to some or other. *Quæ est enim gens* (said *Tully* in his time) *aut quod genus hominum, quod non habeat sine doctrinâ anticipationem quandam deorum?* for what Nation (said he) or what sort of men is there, which hath not even without instruction a preconceit of a God? And *Seneca* in like manner, that there was no Nation so lost to all civility and good manners, which did not believe some God or other. A thing which those Authors were competently qualifi'd to affirm, considering the age and place they liv'd in: The Romans, of which they were, having at that time not only seen and vanquish'd the greatest part of the then known world, but also brought home their Gods with them. But then if we moreover consider what discoveries of the world have been since made, but how little discovery men have been able to make of the infidelity of Atheism, so the belief of a God will be found to be yet more general and natural, to grow out of every soil as well as to prosper in it; the long concealing of those parts of the world from that, which we ourselves inhabit, leaving no place for supposing that it was transplanted from us to them. Neither is it any prejudice to this consent, that here and there one hath been found, who have denied the being of a God. For beside that the dissent of a few can take but little from that general consent by which we have shewn the belief of a God to be established; it will be render'd yet more inconsiderable, if a probable cause may be assign'd of that their departure from other men. Which that there may, the knowledge we have of the pravity of human nature, as well as of the absurdities that have crept into religion, doth abundantly declare. For as it is not much to be wondred, that they, whose vitious inclinations prompted them to wish there were no God, should by those very inclinations be tempted also to believe there is none; so, much less, that they should so opine, who saw nothing of religion but what was sullied by the follies and superstitions of the Heathen: These, as they could not but stir the indignation of considerate men, so being apt enough to create in them

them an abhorrency of all, because they were acquainted with no other. After the same manner that they say that in *Italy* there are the greatest Atheists as well as the most superstitious Bigots in the whole World; as being made so by the palpable follies of those who are zealous in their profession, and by the as palpable cheats that are put upon them by their Priests. In short, if there are or have been those who have bid defiance to the Deity, and so seem'd to make a breach upon that general consent by which the belief of a Deity hath been established, yet (as I shall shew anon when I come to handle it) even they have been forc'd at last to change their note, or invalidated their seeming dissent by their own fears and horrors. Now I demand of any man, who is not lost to all reason as well as to Religion, how comes it to pass that this belief should be so general, and, setting aside a few particulars, universal also? were it not that it is grounded upon principles obvious to all, or (which will come all to one) connatural to the Soul of man, and stamp'd upon it in indelible Characters. For as nature itself teacheth us, that such as the effect is, such also must be the cause from whence that effect proceedeth; so the belief, whereof we speak, being general, it must needs have some common cause, which can be no other than either God, or Nature, or Tradition. If God be this common cause, we have what we desire, for then there is a God, which is the thing in question. If Nature, then is the belief of a God as natural to us as our selves, and consequently it is natural and necessary for us to believe a falsehood, if this be to be accounted one. And as for Tradition or any other wayes of instilling this notion of a God into the minds of men; beside that it cannot well be imagin'd how it should come to spread so universally unless proceeding from the first man, which why he should impose so upon all his posterity no rational account can be given; It is not to be conceiv'd how Tradition and Education should fix this belief, were there not in the minds of men something to dispose them to it, or confirm it there after it hath been once implanted. As will appear if we consider first, upon whom this supposed Tradition hath prevail'd, and secondly, how Tradition comes to prevail upon the minds of men. For are they only Fools or Children, who have been induc'd to believe a God, persons devoid of understanding, or whose understandings have not as yet come to maturity? Nay is not the same the belief of the wise and aged, of those who had abilities to consider and have actually employ'd them? And is it imaginable that these also should easily swallow so groundless a notion, or that, if they found it dissonant to the reasonings of their own minds, they would not in fine shake it off? Especially, when there have not been wanting among them, who have had temptation enough so to do, from the irregularity of their own lives. This as it is not to be conceiv'd of men that are but tolerably wise, so would not have ever enter'd into the jealous head of the Atheistical person, were it not that he was more desirous to avoid the force of so general a consent, than that he apprehended it could be fairly avoided. But because it may conduce not a little to the removing of this umbrage to shew from whence Tradition receives it's force, as well as upon whom this supposed Tradition hath prevail'd; therefore I think it not amiss to make this also the subject of my enquiry, and allot it a just consideration. Now there are but two things which can give force to a Tradition; to wit, either its consonancy to the reasonings of our own minds, or the credit and authority of the Traditors. If the former of these be allow'd to be the ground of that by which the belief of a God is said to have been established, we have then as much as we desire, because enough to shew against the Atheist, that the belief of a God is consonant to the

reasonings of our own minds, and therefore at least probable to be true. If the latter, I would fain know how men came to place so great a confidence in the Authority of their Instructors, as against their own inclinations and present satisfaction to receive from them the belief of a God, and afterwards as obstinately to retain it? Was it, or could it be upon any other ground, than that they believ'd them so wise as not to be impos'd upon themselves, and of so much integrity and fidelity that they would not impose upon them? But from whence, I beseech you, came this notion of fidelity and integrity into mens minds, how came it to be the ground either of the Traditors Authority, or of the others belief? Was it not upon the supposition of their obligation to it, and of their actual compliance with it? But how, not first supposing a God, could there be any thing of an obligation, or men fancy to themselves any such thing without it? All obligation (as was before said) resolving it self into the Authority of God, and standing or falling with it. And indeed, as, supposing a God, many things may for his sake come to be believ'd, which are not very sutable to the reasonings of our own minds; so, that either not admitted or remov'd, I doubt the world would not be over-guilty of that credulity which is by the Atheist so strongly charg'd upon it: The notion of a God, as it is commonly apprehended, being not so agreeable to the inclinations and passions of the generality of mankind, that they should be over-forward to admit it. But because it hath been said, that fear at first gave being unto God, to which afterwards, it may be, mens passionate love to themselves made them add an admixture of kindness, and so produc'd that supposed both terrour and comfort, to humane nature; and because this also may be thought to have been that internal principle whereof I spake, and which dispos'd men either to take it up themselves, or receive it from other men; Therefore I shall not unwillingly enter into the *consideration* of it, and so much the rather, because I conceive the want of *that* hath given fear that force which it may seem to have obtain'd. For first of all, are terrour and benevolence the only ingredients of the notion of a God? Nay is not an ability of looking into the hearts of men a like Attribute of the Deity, as the inward esteem that all men think themselves oblig'd to have for him doth plainly declare? Now how came this Attribute of God to enter into mens minds? What ways can any man imagine to himself by which fear should produce it? It is true indeed, supposing a God, and that that God is the Creator of me, so I can easily be induced to believe that he knows me in my most inward parts, and that, because my mind is manifestly the best part of me, I ought to give him the service of it. But how comes fear to produce this conception in me, what is there in it or the usual objects of it that can give occasion to such an apprehension? For beside that men are generally pretty secure of the acts of their own mind; there is nothing else which they have a fear of, which they do not content themselves to approve their actions to, as supposing that they are able to look no farther. But let us suppose this fear, whereof we speak, to be as Omnipotent as the Atheist would make it, let us suppose it able to produce the belief of a God, or of any thing else which is commonly believ'd concerning him; Yet is there not within us a thing call'd reason as well as fear? Nay doth not that reason in time take off from our fears, doth it not make us at length to throw off all groundless ones? How otherwise comes it to pass that those Mormo's, which do so affright us in our younger years, come afterwards to lose their terror, and to be the matter rather



rather of our disport than dread? How comes it to pass, that unless it be in persons of weak minds, and as weak resolutions, they have no footsteps at all in the thoughts, nay that they have not even in those the force they before had? And is it not then as reasonable to believe, that the fear of God should also leave us, but especially that it should leave those that have had the hardiness to enquire? Which that it doth not, we have not only the general experience of the World to warrant, but the fears of those who do deny him, and concerning some of whom it hath been observ'd, that in the dark and solitude of the night, no Child hath been more fearful than they. So hard a matter is it, or rather impossible to find out any thing save the reasonings of our own minds, which may give an account of that general belief of a God, which hath prevailed in the world; and if so, that general belief may pass for at least a probable proof of his existence, and so induce men both to believe and revere him.

Of the like nature, and no less probable a proof (because we have already enervated that fear which is supposed to be the ground both of the belief of a God and that) of the like nature, I say, and no less probable is that proof which is drawn from the force of Conscience even in vitious men, especially when alarmed by any great danger. For if there be no such thing as a God whose displeasure they have cause to fear, why do they tremble at the consideration of their own impieties when any danger is near? Thus we are told by an Author <sup>a</sup> of good credit, that *Caligula*, <sup>a</sup> *Suet. in Vita: Nam qui deos tantopere contemneret, ad minima tonitrua & fulgura connumerat, caput obvolvunt, ad vero majora proripere se destrato, sub lectumq; conderi solebat.* who would at other times make himself merry with the powers above, would yet run under a Bed when he heard it thunder; and *Cicero* <sup>b</sup> tells us of *Metrodorus*, that he never beheld any man who did more fear those things which he deni'd to be fear'd, even death and the Gods. Now if there be no such thing as a God, why are such persons afraid of him? If no impiety (as certainly there is none, if there be no God) why doth the consideration of that trouble them? Why are their cheeks pale when death approacheth them, why do their knees smite one against another? Nay why do they in their sickness pray to that God, whom, when they were well, they deni'd to be at all? For thus we are told of one *Bion Borysthenites* <sup>c</sup>, who in his health scoff'd at the Gods, and at every one whom he saw at prayer to them; but falling sick he endeavour'd to appease them by burning incense upon their Altars, and beg'd pardon for his former crimes. So deeply rooted in the minds of men is the belief of a God, that even they, who would shake it off, cannot, and they do by their fears confess that God, whom both in words and works they profess to deny.

But because the proofs I have hitherto alledged are rather probable than necessary, and, beside that, lead us to others that are of a higher nature (that which makes these to be in any measure convictive; being the presumption there is of mens meeting with such reasons as satisfied them concerning the Being of a God, and inclin'd them to be accordingly affected in their minds and Consciences) therefore it may not be amiss, especially having before promised it, to enquire after those reasons, that so we also may have the same clearness of evidence. For the better discovery whereof, we will first of all enquire what things are commonly included in the notion of a God, and then see how each of those is established by the clear light of reason. Now there are five things included in the notion of a God, and which therefore, if we can so establish, we may rest abundantly satisfied that there is one.

i. That

1. That he is eternal, or without beginning of being.
2. That he is such an eternal being, as hath in it all the perfections of being that we are acquainted with.
3. That there is no other such eternal being besides himself.
4. That he giveth being to all other things.
5. That he upholds and governs them.

1. That there is an eternal being, or such as is without beginning of being, will need no other proof, than that nothing can give a being unto it self. A thing so evident that the contrary thereof implies a contradiction, from which of all others the mind of man doth most abhor. For that, which gives *being*, being antecedent to that on which it doth so bestow it, if any thing could give being to it self it might be both before and after it self, and so both be and not be together; *be* as giving being, because action presupposeth being, and *not be*, because to be produc'd. But from hence it will also follow, that there is an eternal being, or such as had no beginning of being. For if all things had a beginning of being, something must give being to it self, because so there could be nothing else to take its beginning from. And indeed, how shy soever they, who decry a Deity, are of acknowledging any thing that may be thought to give countenance to it, yet thus far they have found themselves oblig'd to go, as to acknowledge an eternity somewhere, and have accordingly attributed it, either to the world as it now is, or to that matter whereof it was compos'd.

2. But because men do not conceive of God as only an eternal being, but as such also as hath in it self all the perfections of being, at least that we are acquainted with, as that too after an infinite and unlimited manner; therefore pass we on to shew that there is such an eternal being, which will bring us yet nearer to the thing we aim at. And here indeed is the greatest difficulty, but which, to attain a due conviction of a Deity, it will be necessary to surmount. For beside that this is the notion which all sober men have of God, that eternal being whereof we speak may be otherwise any thing else rather than God; nay it may be no other than matter, which an Atheist will acknowledge, because inducing upon him no obligation to be Religious: All obligation resulting from the benevolent mind of our Benefactor, which *matter* as such cannot be suppos'd to be capable of. Now that there is an eternal being which hath all the perfections of being that we are acquainted with, will appear if we can derive the descent of man from some eternal being. For as man is confessedly the noblest of those beings that we are acquainted with, so that which is suppos'd to produce him must contain in it self the same or greater perfections: It being apparent that nothing can give that unto another which it is not possess'd of it self. Now that man had his original from some eternal being, and which therefore is to be suppos'd to be at least of the same perfections with him, this following ratiocination will evince. For supposing, as we must, that the whole race of mankind could not be produced after the manner that they now are, and consequently that there was some one or more that were not so produc'd, I demand whether that one or more were produc'd at all or not. If we say they were not, then have we some one or more eternal beings, from whence the other deriv'd their own. If we say they were, as we have reason enough to do, because the frailty of humane nature forbids us to believe any of that sort to have had a being from all eternity, I demand by whom they also were produc'd, and so on till we arrive at some being or beings which were

were not produc'd themselves : Because if those men and all their several Authors were produc'd, some of them must be produc'd by themselves, because so there would be nothing left for them to be produced by. Let it remain therefore for an undoubted truth, that the whole race of mankind deriv'd their being from some eternal either being or beings, yea from such as were at least of the same perfections with them. But from hence it will also follow, which will go a great way toward the evincing of a God, that there is an eternal being which is also free in operation, wise, powerful, good, and just, because these are more or less in many of the individuals of humane nature, but however in a great degree in some. All therefore that will upon this head be farther requisite to shew is, that this eternal being whereof we speak is infinite in all his perfections, which his eternity alone, if well considered, will sufficiently confirm. For as no reason can be given why that which is eternal *à parte ante*, should not be so also, *à parte post*, and consequently infinite in its duration, that firmitude which kept it intire from all eternity, serving as well to qualifie it for a like continuance to perpetuity ; so much less can any reason be assign'd why it should not be as infinite in all other its qualifications and endowments: The infinity of its duration flowing from the perfection of its nature, to which these are no less essential.

3. It appearing from the Premises, that there is an Eternal Being, yea that there is such an eternal being as hath in it all the perfections of being that we are acquainted with, and that too after an infinite and unlimited manner ; What should hinder us from concluding, thirdly, that there is but one eternal being of that nature, which will bring us yet nearer to the evincing of a God ? For though that be an Attribute of God which is not so uniformly acknowledged ; though it be moreover certain from story, that a great part of the world both have and do divide the Deity among an innumerable company of pretenders ; Yet as it is in like manner certain, that that is the notion which all Christians have of him, and which therefore it will concern us, who are upon the Explication of their Creed, to proceed to the establishment of ; so even they who own'd many, as I shall shew by and by, did yet acknowledge one Chief, and to whom therefore, and to whom alone that Appellation was more peculiarly due. Now that there neither is, nor can be any more than one such eternal being, as hath been by us before described and demonstrated, that infinity which I have shewn to adhere to his nature will serve for an abundant evidence. For not to say, that two infinities cannot easily be digested by those who consider only what infinity means ; to admit only of two infinities in power is to destroy both, and introduce Anarchy and confusion into the world : Because as both must be so of equal power, so it shall therefore be alike in theirs to obstruct each other in their several purposes and intendments. And though the Heathen (as was before intimated) canton'd out this power and the Deity among an innumerable company of pretenders ; though they own'd as many Gods as they had Benefactors or benefits for which they suppos'd themselves to be obliged to them ; Yet as they gave a sufficient evidence of the inconvenience of that division in those piques and quarrels which were believ'd to be between them, so they let fall several passages which were no obscure intimations of their receiving one only into their hearts. Witness first those Phrases which Tertullian<sup>d</sup> and others take notice of, and he calls *Testimonium animæ naturaliter Christianæ*. For at the same time they worship'd many Gods, they had yet frequently in their mouths, *God grant, and if God will, and*

<sup>d</sup> Apol. c. 17.  
& Min. Fecl. iii  
Octavio.



\* Plac. v. l. v. s.  
Sect. 7.

† Ruff. in Ex-  
pos. in Symb.  
Apost.  
‡ Iren. li. i. c. 2.  
& Tert. de vel.  
Virg. c. 1.

*God seeth all things* : Phrases which would have sounded oddly, if they had not had some jealousy among them of that *One God* whom we adore. And though *Homer* the chief of the Greek Poets deserv'd very ill of the powers above, as *Longinus* \* hath also observ'd, and indeed contributed much to the corrupting of Religion ; yet even in him we find the great God *Jupiter* stil'd *πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε*, the Father of Gods and Men : Which shews that even in his time but one eternal being was acknowledged ; the rest being no other than as his Ministers and Servants, and in a word no more than the Canonized Saints in the Church of *Rome*. So great reason had the Creed to require the believing *in God*, and the Eastern Church † and some of the Ancients ‡ to require explicitly the believing *in one*. For this may seem to have been the inward sense even of the heathen world, however prevail'd upon by the corrupt traditions of their Fathers to pay their adoration unto many.

4. But neither is there less evidence from the grounds already laid, that this one eternal being, whereof we speak, gives being unto all others, which will bring us yet nearer to a just and adequate conception of a God. For beside that it seems hard to believe, that man, for whom all other things may seem to have been made, should derive his being from it, and those other things be either eternal, or derive their being from somewhat else that was so ; That infinity of power, which we before attributed to it, will leave no place for supposing that there is any thing eternal beside himself. For if there were any thing else eternal, though but in the condition of a material cause, that alone would set bounds to his power, and determine him in his several operations : It being an undoubted principle of reason, that whatsoever is receiv'd must be receiv'd after the measure and capacity of that which is to receive it. Now forasmuch as there can be no other eternal being than what we have before describ'd, and all things that are must derive their being from some eternal one, he and he alone must be suppos'd to give being to them, which was the thing to be demonstrated by us. Only because all created beings do not immediately derive their own from him, and beside that, there are no contemptible impressions upon them of the power and wisdom of him from whom they are, I think it not amiss to instance in some of them, and in the manner of their generation or production.

And here not to exercise my readers with any curious speculations, nor indeed with any other than lie open to the meanest understandings ; I shall desire him who either denies or doubts of a Deity, to consider any single plant which his Garden or Field is furnished withal. From a small and inconsiderable seed, after it hath been cast into and fermented in the earth, there branch out many little strings to make it take the surer hold in the earth. When it hath so done, it sends up a stalk, that stalk brancheth it self again into several stems, which as they unite the leaves to the stalk, so disperse the juice they receive from the root into the several parts of them by a thousand little rivulets or veins. And indeed as there is nothing, which can afford a greater pleasure to a mind that is given to contemplation, so cannot any considerate man want the proof of a God by whom this one thing shall be duly weighed. For how is it possible, that from so small a seed should spring a thing of so curious a make as every leaf of a plant is, if the juice which ariseth from it were not guided into its several Channels by the Alwise God that formeth all things ? So true is that known saying of the Poet, *Ostendit qualibet herba deum*. For not only every plant, but every leaf of a plant proclaims both its maker

maker and ours. But then for flowers, who is there that can look upon them, and not see in them and adore their maker? Into how many thousand curious shapes do we see them contriv'd, with what variety of colours adorn'd, and some of them, the Tulip especially, how admirably checker'd, what rare marks are some of them stain'd withal; Even *Solomon in all his glory* (as our Saviour sometime spake of the Lilie) was not *array'd like one of these*: Partly because all such glory is but borrowed from other Creatures, and is therefore to the beauty of flowers, but as a painted face to a good complexion; and partly because in it self it is infinitely inferiour to it, and like the daubing of a Country Painter to a piece of *Titian* or *Vandike*. A thing which every mans own eyes may inform him of, who shall but approach any thing near to the most exquisite works of art; it being easy to discover in them those ruggednesses and inequalities which are not to be discern'd in the more curious contexture of the other. Now I demand of the incredulous man, who gave the Tulip all this glory, out of whose Wardrobe was it furnished with its apparel, who toyl'd or spin'd for it? Not the plant it self; for that hath nothing of care or contrivance in it, nay it doth not so much as know its own beauty, or how it attain'd it. How much less then that dull clod out of which it grew, and which it would be a miracle to find to be of so much understanding only, as to know what it self did towards it? But to what then shall we attribute this and other such miraculous effects, for so no doubt they are, and would be esteem'd, did not the commonness thereof take from it? Certainly to no other than to the wisdom of that eternal being, from which this and all other beings have been shewn to derive their own. For to attribute them to chance, were to be more blind than that chance is suppos'd to be; because the manifest effects of an excellent wisdom, and such as the wit of man, how great soever, is not able in any measure to imitate. The same is to be said of the bodies of living Creatures, and particularly of humane ones. For how small and contemptible a thing do these take their beginning from, from how unlike a thing to that to which they do afterwards arrive? And this too without the contrivance, or only privity of him that begat, or her that conceiv'd, but in such a way also as all considerate men stand amaz'd at, and do therefore only believe, because their own experience assures them of it. For where there is no knowledge or contrivance in the immediate causes, who can forbear to refer both them and their effects to the guidance of a superiour, and much more intelligent one.

5. But because how true soever it may be that there is such an eternal being as we have before describ'd, yet there would be but little religion in the world if men did not also believe that he upheld and govern'd the several beings of it, gratitude of it self being too slight a motive to oblige men to the adoration of it; And because however *Epicurus* contented himself with an unactive Deity, yet no man besides himself ever believ'd that Deity not to concern it self about the management thereof; Lastly, because that religion, the Articles whereof I have taken upon me to explain, enjoins us to believe that God is a rewarder of those that diligently seek him, as well as the maker of those that do, and of all other beings: Therefore I deem it but necessary to add the proof of this unto the other, and evince it both by probable and necessary arguments.

And here in the first place, I shall again appeal unto that consent which I before made use of in the evincing of a God. For have they who have thus unanimously believ'd a God contented themselves with that belief?

Nay have they not with the same consent believ'd that God to watch over the world, have they not declar'd that belief of their's by their demeanour and actions? Why otherwise so many Prayers to their Gods when in distress or within view of one, as their praises and thanks when they have emerged out of it? Why did they under the one lie prostrate at the feet of their Altars, why did they after the other crown and adorn the horns of them? Why all this, I say, but that they believ'd the world to be under their conduct, and that they dispens'd both mercies and judgments as they pleas'd? For otherwise they might as well have prayed to the images wherein they suppos'd them to inhabit, or have paid their thanks to a stock or stone that was never consecrated into one. And indeed so far am I from thinking, that any, who did cordially believe a God, did ever believe that God not to concern himself in the administration of the world, that I am apt to believe the contrary persuasion concurr'd in a great measure to the introducing Polytheism into it. For observing to how many particularities the care of the Deity must extend, if it were only to secure man from those evils to which he was obnoxious; lest that care should lie too heavy upon, or not be sufficiently discharg'd by one, they substituted many inferior deities, and whose province accordingly it should be to watch over those several things by which the life of man was to be preserved. Though granting that to be only a conjecture, yet may no contemptible argument be drawn from thence to evince a consentient belief of Gods superintending over the world: Because those Gods were multiplied proportionably to the several sorts of beings which it contain'd, and appointed to preside over them and preserve them.

From the consentient belief of the world pass we to those reasons that may be suppos'd to have occasion'd it, which will yet more ascertain the divine providence unto us. Where again I will consider that Providence, as upholding those things which are in being, and then as directing and governing them.

Of the former of these no doubt at all can be made by those, who consider that they receiv'd their being from the emanations of the divine providence. For to continue them in that being there must be a continuance of the same emanations<sup>f</sup>, because those, and those alone are the foundation of it. Neither will it avail to say that the contrary is observable in meaner Agents, as whose works do abide, even when they themselves do not, and therefore much more when they have left off to concern themselves about them. For beside that they work upon a pre-existent matter, and do not so much give a being to them, as a modification thereof; that they do abide at all, is not through any efficacy of their respective producers, but through the strength and qualifications of those materials which they work upon. Which strength and qualifications as we have no reason to ascribe to any other than God, so those once remov'd, their works would also fail, and not only cease to be what they were made by them, but to be at all. Now for as much as even those works which are made of a pre-existent matter do not owe their continuance to the efficacy of the agent, but to the strength and qualifications of those materials whereof they are made; for as much as that strength and those qualifications cannot be suppos'd to have any other original than the emanations of a divine power: Supposing those emanations not continu'd, both they and all other works that depend upon them, must fail together with them, and return to their pristine nothingness. So great reason had our Saviour to make answer, when faulted for curing a man upon the Sabbath, as if thereby

<sup>f</sup> Stillingfl. Orig. Sacr. li. 3. c. 3.



thereby he had offered an affront to God who rested upon it himself, *My father worketh hitherto and I work.* For though God did after <sup>2</sup> Joh. 5. 17. his six days of labour leave off to create any new beings; yet he was not idle; because ministring fresh supplies every day to those which he then made, and being as busy in providing for them as he was once in creating them. I will conclude this affair with that of *Maximus Tyrius*<sup>b</sup>, and so much the rather because it will minister a fair entrance into that which follows. *For neither (saith he) is Jupiter ever idle. For so would the heavens have ceased to move, and the earth to fructifie, rivers to flow, and the seas to receive them, &c. So would the vertues of men have ceas'd, the safety of animals, and the production of fruits. Yea this whole Universe would again have been confounded and disorder'd. But the diligence of Jupiter being unwearied, and constant, and sleeplest, and neither fainting under, nor remitting of its work; ministers an eternal supply to all beings whatsoever.*

<sup>b</sup> Οὐδέ γάρ ὁ Ζεὺς χαλῆν ἔχει· ἢ γὰρ ἂν ἐταύτο καὶ ἔργον πει-  
θεύμεν, καὶ γὰρ τρέψαν-  
τα καὶ ποταμοὶ ῥέ-  
οντες, καὶ δι-  
χομένη θά-  
λασσα &c. Ἐ-  
παύσαντο δ'  
ἂν καὶ αἱ ἀνθρώ-  
πων ἀρεταί.

καὶ ζῶντων σωτηρίαι, καὶ καὶ πᾶσι γενέσκει· καὶ τὸ πᾶν οὗτο ἀντιείδοντο διαλλόμενον συνεχέσθαι· ἀλλ' ἡ δὲ Διὸς προ-  
ματρία ἀντρεῖ· ὅσα καὶ διμνησκὲς καὶ ἀκούοντο, καὶ μηδὲ ποτε ἀπαγορεύουσα, μηδὲ ἐπαναχωρεῖσα τὸ ἐαυτῆς  
ἔργον, αἰνεῖται χορηγὴ τῆς σωτηρίας τοῖς ὅλοις. Dissert. Vitam activam contemplativam preferendam.

It being thus evident that God upholds all things in their respective beings, and that, if he did not, they would fall back to their first nothing; enquire we what assurance there is of his directing and governing them in their several operations, which is the next thing affirm'd by us concerning the divine providence. For the evidencing whereof, I will consider it with respect to irrational agents; and such operations too of rational ones wherein their reason interposeth not; and then as to rational ones considered as such. That God directs and governs the operations of irrational agents, will need no other proof than that they are manag'd with the same or a greater prudence than those of rational ones. For there being no appearance on the one hand, that one of infinite wisdom and power should stand by as unconcern'd, when he hath so large a field to exercise them in, and there being less appearance on the other of their directing their own operations, because having nothing of reason to direct them by; they must of necessity be suppos'd to be directed by that God by whom they were created and are sustain'd. And though man be a creature of another nature, and furnished with no contemptible reason for the directing of his own actions; yet as even his reason is not so strong, as not sometimes to stand in need of the assistance of a superiour one, so there are many things done in and by him in which his reason interposeth not, and which therefore, because manag'd with no little prudence, are to be ascribed to the divine. I instance in that by which our being next under God is supported, and which will withal shew our sustentation to be from him, as well as the direction of our actions. For though the meat by which that is done be in order thereto receiv'd by us into our mouths, and transmitted from thence into our Stomachs, yet farther than that neither our care nor knowledge extends; we concern not our selves any farther, neither would it avail us though we did. We do not give direction to our Stomachs which way they should proceed, we give no laws to their concoction, nor direct them in the several changes which our aliment is to pass before it turn into flesh and blood. The faculties whereby all these things are done are purely natural; they are not so much as under the inspection of our soul, and much less under its care and conduct; And must therefore, if they discharge their respective offices

with success, be influenced by a higher reason and care, even the reason and care of him, from whom they did originally proceed. But neither is there less evidence of Gods presiding over those actions of men which are in a great measure under the conduct of their own reason. For being God cannot be suppos'd to have any other end in the creating of the world, than the advancing of his own glory by it, and man the chiefest part of the creation was left to the guidance of his own will, and consequently might as well thwart as minister to that great end, did not God either direct or moderate his actions, it might be in his power to obstruct it, which it is not to be suppos'd that so wise and powerful an agent would permit. And indeed as it is not imaginable how Gods glory could be at all secur'd if there were not such an over-ruling providence as we speak of; so it is as hard to be conceiv'd, that human nature should otherwise have subsisted so long in the world, as the Histories of past times assure us that it hath. For the greatest part of mankind having nothing more in their eye, than the advancing of their own fortunes and greatness; being moreover so intent upon that, as not to be restrain'd, even by the bands of religion, from the doing of any thing, how bad soever, which may contribute to the promotion of them; what could any man rationally expect, supposing Providence remov'd, but that violence and rapine should enter, and this world thereby become one great solitude? An image of this we have in those places where there is no settled government, or where, as the Scripture speaks, there is *no King*. For then every man naturally doth that which is right in his own eyes, every man injures or invades his Brother. And were there not a great Superintendent over the world, there is no doubt there would be much more confusion in it, even whilst the State doth not want one to manage it: The fear of a single person or a Senate being a weak restraint to the exorbitant wills of a giddy multitude. A thing which is in part acknowledg'd by those, who are the greatest enemies to religion; they accounting of the *belief* of a God and the consequent doctrines of it as a necessary engine to keep the people in obedience to their Governours. To all which if we add (because Government supposeth a consideration of mens deserts) the many instances God gives of his kindness to good men, as, on the other side, of his displeasure against evil; if we consider by what odd means, and after what distance of time crimes secretly committed have been brought to light, and the Authors thereof thereby brought to suffer the deserved punishment thereof; Lastly, if we consider the many illustrious instances the Histories of all nations afford us of Gods favour and benevolence to Good Princes, as, on the other side, of his vengeance upon wicked though potent ones; so we shall find reason enough to conclude, though we do not always discern the reasons of his procedure, that there is such a thing as we call Providence, and that, as all things whatsoever were made by him, so they are directed by him in their several operations, as may most serve to the illustration of his own glory, and particularly of that of his wisdom, and justice, and goodness. Only because there is such an evil under the Sun, or at least imagined to be, that there be just men unto whom it hapneth according to the work of the wicked, and wicked men to whom it hapneth according to the work of the righteous, each of which may seem to be no small derogation to that providence which we inculcate; I think it not amiss to take off from that umbrage, and so dismiss both the argument and this first great Article of our belief.

In order whereunto the first thing that I shall propose, is to consider  
with

with our selves whether those, at whose misfortunes we stumble; be in truth, what they seem both to themselves and us, that is the Godly. For beside that some have assum'd to themselves that name, who have been arrant Hypocrites, making no other use of religion than to draw the silly multitude into a good opinion of them, and thereby oblige them to countenance and assist them in their designs; the world is very apt to mistake that for godliness, which hath little or nothing of it; yea which bears a perfect contrariety to it. For thus; if a man be of our perswasion or faction, if he resort diligently to his parish Church; or run to this or that meeting, this or that is by several men thought to be a sufficient character of his godliness, and the divine providence must be forthwith call'd in question if any calamity befall him. Though I would to God the deception did end here, and men did not only take imperfect measures of godliness, but perverse and contradictory ones. For so certainly it is, to think it *such* to persecute Christ's Apostles and Servants, and worry the Church as well as slight and forsake it. And yet our Saviour hath told us that a time should come, when they, who did so, should think they did God service. Now if it should happen, as it often doth, that God should bring the wheel over these men, and return their violence upon their own pates, they, no doubt, would be apt enough to think themselves hardly dealt with, as others of their own complexion to question the divine providence because of it. Which is to question it for that, for which we ought to revere it, even for being strictly just.

But as on the one hand we should do well to consider, whether they, at whose misfortunes we stumble, be really what they seem to be; so, on the other, whether those wicked men are really happy, whose seeming prosperity is a trouble to us. Not that I desire any man to question his own eyes, or that intelligence which those give of such mens success and splendor; nor yet to think I mean thereby any other happiness than what the world is wont to call by that name; But whether there be not something mixed with their prosperity, which may sow all their other enjoyments. For, if not only the Scriptures but the Stories of all Nations do not misinform us, there is nothing more usual than for the unjust and cruel man to be haunted with his own guilt or alarmed with his own fears. As *Cain* spake when God told him of the murder of his Brother *Abel*, they are afraid lest every one that meeteth them should kill them. Hence their being so carefully environed, when they are abroad, with strong guards of Souldiers, as within, with locks and bars; and, lest that should not be enough, their shifting their lodging often, but however taking care that they may have several by-passages to escape at. A thing which was observ'd of the late Usurper<sup>1</sup>, by one, who because an ordinary attendant about him, had opportunity enough to know. And will any man be so fond as to think those persons happy, or so foolishly wicked as to quarrel the divine providence because of it? Will they look upon him as a favourer of those, whom he doth so signally punish, or which is next to that conclude, that there is no such thing as a God? If they either will or can make such an inference, it is a sign they as little understand the happiness of this world, as they seem to be desirous of being acquainted with the next. For when all is done, the serenity and calmness of the mind is one of the principal happinesses of human life, and he who wants that is more miserable by far, than the most despicable worm he tramples on.

It would be considered thirdly, because otherwise we shall trouble our selves

<sup>1</sup> G. Barius M.  
D. in Elenchi  
Mot. nuper.  
Part 2. p. 350:  
*Intra aedes quot  
seris, quot cla-  
vibus compri-  
muntur fores?  
Raro ter aut se-  
pius eodem in  
cubiculo perno-  
tabat, nec in  
ullo quocunque,  
quod duobus  
tribusve non pa-  
tebat possidere*



selves to give an account of that which is not; whether of those that are really good there be not many that thrive and prosper, as in like manner of wicked men who receive according to their deserts. For that suppos'd, as is but reason; the controversy will still lie within a narrower compass, and the question will be only why some good men are improsperous, and some evil men flourish. Of which if a satisfactory account may be given, the objection will fall to the ground, and the divine providence be as secure as it is innocent.

\* Article of  
Christs coming  
to judge the  
quick and the  
dead.

Now the first thing I shall offer as to the prosperity of those men, who may seem to deserve a contrary fate, is that which is assign'd, I do not say by Christianity, but by all religions whatsoever; to wit that there shall be a judgment after this life wherein mens actions shall be review'd, and a suitable reward apportion'd them. What the grounds of such a belief are shall be hereafter<sup>k</sup> declar'd, when I have a more proper place for it; it may suffice here to observe, that this hath been the constant and uniform perswasion of the world, and such as may therefore satisfy those, who have otherwise reason enough to believe both a God and a Providence. For are not the writings of the Heathen full of the Stories of *Minos* and *Rhadamanthus*, of their Elysian Fields and their *Tartara*? Are not the Jews, how sparing soever their Scriptures are in giving an account of them, known to have imbib'd a like perswasion, as their looking upon the Sadducees as Hereticks doth plainly declare? Lastly (for I will say nothing concerning the doctrine of Christianity, because what its opinion is, is sufficiently known) is not the doctrine of *Mahumet*, which hath now diffus'd it self over a great part of the world, known to inculcate the same future state, and prompt men to the expectation of it? Now if there be a future judgment and another world, as the consent of so many dissenting parties gives us reason enough to believe; if men, however it may be with them here, shall not there fail to receive according to their respective deserts, no wonder if God do in part defer the inflicting of vengeance until then; nay it would be a greater wonder if he should not sometime permit wicked men to prosper. For the contrary would but remove out of mens minds the belief of a judgment, and of that sad eternity which is to follow it: Which, howsoever it may be look'd upon by some persons, will in fine be found to be one of the most forcible restraints from all impiety and injustice. But beside the judgment of the other world, and to which, as being the solemn time of vengeance, it is but reasonable a great part of that work should be reserved; we are also to consider that God is merciful as well as just, and may therefore permit evil men to thrive and prosper. For though they are now in a state of sin and enmity to the divine majesty, yet it is not impossible but they may hereafter bethink themselves of a return, yea his continual favour and kindness may oblige them to it. Though if they should not, the divine goodness will appear the more illustrious, and they be rendred the more inexcusable for the neglect of it. And truly, if the best of us did but impartially consider how much we our selves stand in need of the same long-suffering and forbearance, we should not be over-much offended at the expressions of it to others, or question Gods providence because of it. For if Gods vengeance must tread upon the heels of sin, or else no providence will be allow'd, I fear it will soon overtake us also, and we be forc'd to confess one by our own dear-bought experience.

Of no less easy a resolution is that adversity of good men, which is a trouble to weak minds; and a rock of offence to impious ones. For it may teach

teach them that *humility*, with which prosperity is but little acquainted, but which the infinite distance that is between us and God obligeth to put on; nay it may raise them as much in their desires and endeavours, as they fall in their own opinion, because prompting them to look after more solid and durable joys. It may give them an opportunity to exercise those great virtues of patience and contentedness (for what patience and contentedness is it to bear a splendid fortune?) it may evidence to themselves and the world that they do not serve God out of mean and unworthy ends. Lastly, it may be an assurance to them of a great reward in Heaven (for *God is not unrighteous* <sup>1</sup> *to forget our labour of love and patience*) yea that they have not received their reward already. By these and such like considerations may good men come to be reconciled to their adversity, and not only to be reconciled to it, but to affect it. And then certainly it will be a very weak thing to doubt of a Providence because of it, yea not to look upon that adversity as a signal instance of one to them. What remains then (for this is but the natural and easy result of my discourse) what remains, I say, but that we adore God not only as our maker but our sustainer, that we alway trust in him as we alway depend upon him? That we remember no evil can befall us without his permission or disposition, and bear it therefore with cheerfulness; that all blessings are dispensed unto us by him, and accordingly pay him our thanks and praise? In fine, that by his Alwise providence the worst of evils may turn to our advantage, and be a strong confirmation to us of that providence which they seem to destroy? So doing, we shall not only come to *believe in God*, in that better though not more proper notion of the Phrase; but engage him by that belief of ours to advance us to that place, where we shall experiment to the full the saving effects of that Providence, which we have now only an earnest of.

<sup>1</sup> Heb. 6. 10.

A  
**DIGRESSION**  
 CONCERNING  
 The Truth of CHRISTIAN RELIGION  
 AND THE  
 Divine Authority of the Scriptures,  
 By way of Preparation to the  
**EXPLICATION**  
 And Establishment of the  
**FOLLOWING ARTICLES**  
 OF THE  
**APOSTLES CREED.**

The Contents.

*After an account of the grounds of this Digression, enquiry is made into the truth of Christian Religion. In order whereunto is shewn first, that there was such a person as Jesus Christ, as secondly, that he receiv'd that Religion of his from God. This latter evidenc'd from the prevalency it had over the world, from the great piety and sanctity thereof, and from the miracles wherewith it was attended. A like enquiry made into the Divine authority of the Scriptures, in order whereunto is shewn first, that they were written by men worthy of credit, and then by those who were divinely inspir'd. A conclusion of the whole with a particular application of it to those parts of the New Testament, whereof there was anciently some doubt in the Church.*

**T**hat there is a God and a Providence is so generally agreed on, that that alone would render it highly probable to all sober enquirers; but what the distinct nature or properties of that God are, or how he ought to be worshipp'd, the world hath been as much divided, and continues so to this very day. The reason whereof is, because men, through the weakness of their



their understandings, have been forc'd to receive their notices concerning them, not from the dictates of reason which are uniform, but from Tradition and supposed Revelations: Which as it was not hard for some men to counterfeit in those darker times wherein they liv'd, so those which were true, if any were, may easily be conceiv'd in passing from hand to hand to receive several changes according to the different fancies and humours of those who have related them. Now amidst so great variety and uncertainty, what shall miserable man pitch upon, where shall he fix his fluctuating understanding? To suppose all false were extremely unreasonable, and, beside that, highly derogatory to that providence, which we have already shewn to watch over the world. And to take that for true, without any farther disquisition, which we have been train'd up in, is not only unworthy of a rational man, but extremely hazardous also. For if other men have been deceiv'd by adhering to the Religion of their Country, why not we also, especially when building upon the same sandy foundation with them? That therefore we may proceed with some assurance in a matter of so great importance, it will be but necessary to bring it to the touchstone, but however before we go about to explicate the several Articles of it: It being a fond thing to spend time in searching after the meaning of that, of which we have no assurance whether it be any thing better than an imposture.

Now as where question is made concerning the truth of any reveal'd Religion, we are of necessity to be satisfied concerning both the being and authority of him by whom it is pretended to have been made known; so to give a due establishment to *that*, the more proper and peculiar Articles whereof we are in the next place to explain, I will shew,

1. That there was such a person as Jesus Christ, to whom our Religion entitles it self.
2. That he receiv'd it from God.

1. That there was such a person as Jesus Christ, we have as good ground to believe, as any matter of fact can be supposed to be capable of; it being witnessed to by men of all persuasions whatsoever, by those who were adversaries to as well as friends of his Religion. It is the confession of the Jews the greatest Enemies Christianity ever had, and by whom he is ignominiously stil'd משיח or the hanged person. It is the Confession of the Heathen as well as of the Jews, and who, as it appears by their Character of him, never meant to be his Proselytes. For thus *Suetonius*<sup>a</sup> in the life of *Claudius* the Emperour, He banish'd the Jews out of *Rome* for the uproars that they made upon the incitation of one Chrest or Christ. And *Tacitus*<sup>b</sup> in like manner, where he speaks of the punishment of his followers, the Christians, That the Author of that name and sect was one Christ, who was put to death in the Reign of *Tiberius* by *Pontius Pilate* Governour of *Judea*. In fine, it is the confession yea boast of all those who have from the beginning been initiated into his Religion, and whose testimony is the more considerable because they sealed it with their blood, and chose rather to deny themselves, than either him or that Religion which he promulgated.

<sup>a</sup> *Judeos, impulsore Chresto, assidue tumultuantes Româ expulit.*

<sup>b</sup> *Annal. l. 15. Auctor nominis ejus Christus, qui Tiberio imperitante per Procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat.*

2. No doubt at all being to be made of the *being* of him, by whom our Religion is pretended to have been made known, proceed we to shew that he receiv'd it from God, which will take away all doubt concerning it: What God speaks to us by another, being as truly his own, as if it were immediately revealed to us by himself. Now that our Saviour receiv'd

this Religion of ours from God, will appear, if we consider, that, as he pretended to receive it from him, so it hath these three things to justify that pretence.

1. The prevalency it had over the world.

2. The great piety and sanctity thereof.

3. The miracles wherewith it was attended. For it being impossible to conceive by what more convictive proofs God could assure us of his mind, supposing him dispos'd to do it, either God must be suppos'd to have left us under a necessity of being deceiv'd, which is sufficiently contrary to his goodness and providence, or we must look upon these where they concur as an evidence of his owning that to which they shall be found to be affix'd.

1. For, to begin with the first of these, even the prevalency of our Saviours doctrine, and which under such circumstances never hapned to any doctrine in the world; Who is there that shall consider it, but must be tempted to look upon it as a doctrine of God, and as such, assisted and promoted by himself? There being not only nothing in it, or in its respective circumstances, to procure it that prevalency, but very much to retard and hinder it. Is the person of a Teacher of any consideration in this affair, as indeed what signifies more either to the promoting or obstructing it? The promulger of this Religion, as both its friends and enemies confess, was a mean and obscure person, the Son of a Carpenter, and a Carpenter himself. A man slighted by the chieftest of his own Nation, as by the Scribes and Pharisees, or if own'd by any of them, as *Nicodemus*, yet secretly only, and when there was no witness of it to discover them: followed generally by none but the common sort, and a Company of ignorant and beggerly Fishermen. In fine, persecuted and revil'd as long as he continu'd in the world, and sent out of it by a painful and inglorious death: A death which was proper to thieves and murderers, and which he himself suffer'd between such. And yet this obscure, and maligned, and crucified person hath, notwithstanding all this, had his doctrine receiv'd throughout the world, and his greatest reproach look'd upon as their greatest honour, his cross being imprinted upon the foreheads of his followers, and pourtray'd upon the Banners of Princes. But it may be the doctrine it self might make amends for the ingloriousness of the teacher, and so no doubt it would, if it had met with unprejudiced minds and pious hearts. But as the world was not then to be first imbu'd with the notions of Religion, so that doctrine which he preach'd was directly contrary to their former both persuasions and inclinations. It was contrary to that Religion which was then receiv'd throughout the world, for it taught them to despise those Gods which they had long believ'd and ador'd; It was contrary to all their passions, and inclinations, and interests, because teaching yea enjoining them to be poor in spirit and humble, to renounce the world and themselves, to take up their Cross and travel after him to *Golgotha*, to submit to any punishments his and their Enemies the Princes that then were should think good to lay upon them: In fine, so contrary to the then apprehensions of the wiser sort, that they look'd upon it as folly or frensie, as the effect either of a weak or of a distemper'd brain. But it may be (for that also is to be considered, where men pretend to give an account of the prevalency of any doctrine) it may be, I say, that this doctrine, however it might diffuse it self, yet took up only with the meaner sort, with men of no great consideration for their extraction, and of as little

little for their understandings. So indeed one would have thought, considering the former prejudices, and so it is likely it might have done if it had not been witness'd to, and assisted from above. But experience assures us, that the prevalency of this doctrine was not more considerable for the number, than for the quality and condition of those that have embrac'd it. For though at first it began with a few, and those too of the meaner sort, yet at length it diffus'd it self throughout the world, and captivated the most considerable persons in it; the rich as well as the poor, the noble as well as the mean and obscure, men of the greatest learning and men of the greatest Authority, the greatest Clerks, and the most puissant Monarchs. Witness for the latter, I do not say only the greatest Princes of these parts of the world, and who have been for many hundreds of years Christian, but all the Roman Emperours from the time of *Constantine* the Great, one *Julian* excepted: for the former, *Justin Martyr*, *Irenaeus*, *Athenagoras*, *Origen*, *Tertullian*, *Clement* *Alexandrinus*, and others; many of which moreover, though bred up in other Religions, and who wanted neither reason nor wisdom to defend them, yet quitted them all for the persecuted doctrine of Christianity, and became the chiefest Fathers and propugners of the Church. Thus far therefore nothing can appear which may entitle the prevalency of Christianity to any natural cause. If they who have a mind to shake it off, can find any relief, it must be in the means by which it was propagated, which yet will do them less service than the other. For though at present Christianity hath the magistrate and his power to befriend it, though it hath learned men, and the wise ones of the world to uphold it, yet for some hundreds of years after the publication of it, it was destitute of those helps, and, which is more, it was so when it was in its greatest purity. Nay I will add yet farther as to the former of these, that the powers that then were, were so far from making use of their Authority to back and propagate it, that they made use of it to suppress it; Insomuch, that the stories both of the Church and of the world, abound with instances of Christians, who were tortur'd for no other reason but because they were such. Will you hear what the fore-mentioned *Tacitus* hath said in this particular? for the testimony of such a one cannot chuse but be of great power and efficacy. Thus therefore he in the fifteenth Book of his Annals after the mention of our Saviours death: *This deadly superstition being for the present repress'd, brake out again afterwards, not only in Judaea which was the fountain of this evil, but also in Rome, where there was a confluence of all vile and abominable things. Therefore first of all those were seiz'd on who confess'd the firing of the City, then by their information a great multitude which was consign'd to the same punishment, not so much for the crime of firing the City, as for the hatred mankind generally bore them, or they seem'd to bear to it, that is to say, for departing from the receiv'd Religion, and treading in by-paths by themselves. For that these were not likely to be guilty of any thing that might deserve so harsh a character, not only his own absolving them from the crime of firing the City, but the Epistle of Plinie to Trajan after this doth sufficiently shew: He there telling us that upon a most severe enquiry he could find nothing in them, but, as he calls it, an evil and immoderate superstition. And yet the same Author avers, that he was not wanting in using severity toward them, and that notwithstanding that their religion spread far. Which also was the reason of his writing to the Emperour about it, desiring him to instruct*

*Repressaq; in  
praesens existia-  
bilis superstitione  
rursus erumpen-  
bat, non modo  
per Judaeam ori-  
ginem ejus ma-  
li, sed per ur-  
bem etiam, quo  
cuncta undiq;  
atrocia aut per-  
denda consuevit  
celebranturq;  
Igitur primo  
correcti qui scie-  
bantur, deinde  
indicio eorum  
multitudo in-  
gens, haud pri-  
us inde in crimine  
incendii quam  
odio humani  
generis convicti  
sunt.*

*Plin. Epist. l.  
10. Ep. 97y*





the several superstitions of the Heathen to have been as wicked as they were foolish, to have ministred to cruelty and injustice, yea to have represented their Gods as notorious for them *themselves*, and the patrons and encouragers thereof in *others*. From all which as Christianity is manifestly averſe, yea to such a degree as to represent some of them as crimes *not to be nam'd* by those who are the professors of it; so it promotes the contrary both by its promises and precepts, by the motives it makes use of, and by the duties it inculcates. Not the least encouragement to believe, that there shall be marrying or giving in marriage in the other world, which was the bait by which *Mahomet* allur'd his followers, but on the contrary, that they should there *ſee God* and be *holy as he himself is holy*. Not the least encouragement to the practice of any impurity for the present. If the eye wander after forbidden objects, it calls it *adultery*, it commands it to be *pull'd out* with the sin that lodgeth in it: But as for the more foul instances thereof, it frequently consigns them to eternal punishment, it shuts the doors of them out of the Kingdom of Heaven. In fine, *whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report, if there be any other vertue or thing worthy of praise;* all these Christianity doth recommend and enjoin, it allures us unto and deters us from the contrary. So that if the highest piety be an argument of a religious descent from Heaven, Christianity is undoubtedly from thence; the doctrine whereof is as much above that of the most sober Moralists, as that was above their own practice, or the common divinity of the times they liv'd in. Phil. 4. 8.

3. Now, as where piety and all vertue is so very well secur'd, we shall have the less reason to be jealous of those miracles by which also Christianity pretends to be assisted; because however God may sometime be suppos'd to tempt men with them, yet there is no reason of believing so there, where his own honour is so well secur'd: so we will therefore proceed to enquire, what testimony those may be suppos'd to bear to the divinity thereof, and how that testimony may appear. For the resolution whereof, I observe.

1. That, as whatsoever the miracles, that attended Christianity, were, they were alledg'd by the Authors thereof as effects of a divine power, and an attestation of his to the truth of that doctrine which they publish'd; so by the confession of the adversaries thereof they are apt to be look'd upon as such, by those who cannot find out any other causes of them: Men naturally ascribing that, of whose existence they cannot find out any other cause, to the immediate power of God, as, what his power doth so interpose in, to a willingness thereby to declare his approbation of that, which it shall be alledged to confirm. Which one thing, supposing a divine providence, will give miracles as much force, as the Authors thereof pretend them to be of. For how can the divine providence be suppos'd to watch over mankind, and particularly, as to what most concerns it, even the businesses of Religion, if he suffer such things to be done in confirmation of an imposture, which are not only alledg'd by the Authors thereof as a testimony of his will, but apt to be look'd upon by the generality of men as such? Especially, when that, which is so attested to, bears so great a conformity to those Precepts which our own reason prompts us to allow.

2. I say secondly, that as they, who deny miracles that force which they

are pretended to be of, do it upon a presumption, either of their not being produced by a divine power, or not being, even so, an approbation of that doctrine which they are alledged to confirm; so if those two presumptions may be voided, that denial of theirs will be found to be unreasonable, and the miracles whereby Christianity is confirm'd pass for a sufficient testimony of Gods owning it as a doctrine of his own. Now that the miracles whereby Christianity was attended (which is the first of the things to be proved) owed their being to a divine power, and not to the power of any inferior Agent, will appear if we consider, that as they require a potent cause to produce them, so those causes, to which men are willing to ascribe them, cannot be suppos'd to do it. It is sufficiently known, yea it is so from the New Testament, that what things are there said to have been wrought by the *finger of God*, are represented by the Jews as the works of evil spirits. For thus when our Saviour cast out Devils, which of all other things one would not have thought should have been ascribed unto them, yet even this was said to have been done by him through the power of the *Prince of the Devils*, and who gave him that Authority over them. But beside that, as our Saviour spake, we have no reason to think the Devil so impolitick, as to contribute to the destruction of his own Kingdom; we have much less reason to think so, unless he had advanc'd it as much another way, which it is certain our Saviour did not. For so far was he from that, that he not only drove out all those superstitions by which he had before beguil'd the world, but (which was certainly the greatest blow that ever was or could be given him) redeem'd those, who had been before led captive by him at his will, from their respective vices, and made them pious, sober, and righteous. The presumption of evil spirits interposing being thus evacuated, and thereby the force of the Christian Miracles asserted from the calumnies of the Jews, proceed we to enquire, because our adversaries will have it so, whether they, by whom they were immediately wrought, wrought them by any *power* or *knowledge* of their own, which is the only cause beside, to which they are or can be entitled. A thing which might well enough be made a question, if the persons, of whom this is reported, had been train'd up in *literature*, or acquainted more than ordinarily with the *Philosophy* of the world: These, by the rare effects of their skill, being likely enough, as it may happen, to procure to themselves the name of *conjurers*, or the reputation of acting by the *great power* of God. But when the Author of our Religion is confess'd to be the Son of a Carpenter, and a Carpenter himself, and his Disciples for the most part mean and ignorant Fishermen; when they, who oppos'd this Religion at the beginning, and were therefore most likely to be acquainted with the weak parts thereof, insisted upon nothing more than the simplicity of its promulgers; he must be a man of a hard forehead who shall pretend for the cause of his incredulity, that they accomplished, what they did, by their own power and wisdom. Now forasmuch as those miracles, wherewith Christianity was attended, requir'd a powerful cause to produce them; forasmuch as they cannot be thought to be produc'd by those other causes to which they are ascrib'd; what should hinder us from concluding them to have been the effects of a divine power according as they were represented by those that did them? Certainly no other, than, what is the usual refuge of a desperate cause, that there may be other ways and means, by which such wonderful effects are produc'd, which we, through the scantness of our own knowledge,



ledge, have no apprehensions of. But beside that men are not wont to withhold their Assent upon *may-be's*, and ought not therefore in reason to withhold it here; those *may-be's* are encountred by much more forcible grounds, and to which therefore they ought in reason to give place. Such as are in particular, the knowledge we have of God's working as well as natural Agents, the readiness of our minds, in the destitution of other causes, to ascribe such effects to him, and the danger that must needs ensue from thence, of owning those as *his* which are not, and consequently also a false Religion upon them. For as if God work as well as natural Agents, those effects whereof we speak may be *his* as well as theirs, and so far therefore *the may-be's* equal; so there is no small presumption of their being *his*, because of that readiness in the destitution of other causes to ascribe such effects to him, and of the danger that would ensue from it, if it should be deceitful: It being not to be thought, that that God who watches over the world and particularly over mankind, would either have implanted or not corrected so pernicious an inclination in us. Since therefore the miracles wherewith Christianity was attended cannot fairly be look'd upon as other than the effects of the divine power, nothing remains for us to shew, but they are also a testimony of Gods approbation of that which they are alledg'd by the workers thereof to confirm. Now that so they are, will appear if we consider that *their* allegation, and the no declaration of God to the contrary. For though miracles, considered as such, have nothing in them of a divine testimony, yet they cannot but be look'd upon as such when they are appeal'd to by those that work them as a proof of his approbation of what they deliver: As because any effect, as well as a verbal declaration, may, by the consent of the Author thereof, pass for a testimony of his mind, so because he may seem to consent to the making of it who suffers another to make use of it, and doth not, when he might, and when his own glory as well as the welfare of his Creatures is concern'd, declare his disallowance of it. For if among men, *Qui tacet consentire videtur*, how much more may we suppose so of God, of whose wisdom and goodness we are so much assur'd, and from whom therefore we shall not need to fear a silence in any thing, which it concerns him, upon the account of his own honour or our welfare, to disallow? Besides, when it cannot be suppos'd, that God, who is generally uniform in his operations, will depart from his usual course, but for some extraordinary end, because, if he should, it would be some reproach to his wisdom, as from the want whereof for the most part such changes do proceed; When it is in like manner evident, that all miracles are a departure from Gods usual procedure, and therefore to be suppos'd to be for some extraordinary end also; Lastly, when miracles, though the result of Gods Almighty power, are yet brought to pass by the ministration of men: from whom can we better understand that end than from those he so makes use of in the producing of them? These, as they are not at all unlikely to be acquainted with it, by reason of that indignation which God shews to them in employing them about them, so being much less likely to be permitted by God to impose upon the world by a different yea perverse conception of it. For so he should not only lose his own end in them, but have them turn'd to his dishonour, which it is not to be suppos'd but one so jealous of his own glory will watch against. So little reason is there to doubt of those miracles wherewith Christianity was attended, being effects of a divine power, and a declaration of Gods approbation of it. And if so, we have yet

yet more evidence of its being true and divine; of its having been receiv'd by our Saviour from God, and so convey'd by him unto the World.

But because it will not avail us to be assur'd of the Divinity of any Religion, unless we be also assur'd where that Religion is to be found (for what can any Religion avail him, who doth not embrace it, or how can he embrace it, who knows not where to find it?) and because however that *Creed*, which I am now upon, may be supposed to contain it, yet it neither furnisheth us with any notice of those proofs by which I have endeavour'd to establish it, nor can be supposed, by reason of its shortness, to give us a full account of the Articles thereof; Lastly, because that, which is but a Summary of any thing, cannot receive a just explication but from that which doth more fully entreat of it; therefore I think it but just to enquire also, where such an Account of it is to be found, and withal, (because the *Creed* hath receiv'd some alterations) one less obnoxious to a change.

There are, it is well known, who, when they are demanded an account of our Religion, remit men for the receiving of it both to Tradition and the Scriptures. I will not now enquire what induceth them so to do, and much less go about to depretiate Tradition by which I acknowledge both the Creed and the Scriptures to have been transmitted to us. It shall suffice me to observe, that as the question between them and us is only concerning things *necessary to salvation*, which we affirm to be either *expressed* in the Scriptures, or fairly *deducible* from them; So there are *three* things which confirm us in that belief. First, that, as Tradition hath handed nothing to us of that nature, which is either more comprehensive, or of greater Authority than the Creed; so all the Articles thereof, even as it now stands, are demonstrable from the Scriptures, and shall accordingly be thence evinced by us. Secondly, that as our Religion owes its being to our Saviour, and is therefore of necessity to lie within the compass of what he taught, which is farther confirm'd by his restraining of his Apostles <sup>k</sup> to the teaching of those things which he had *commanded* them; So there are no less than four of his Disciples who have *de industria* written of his speeches and actions, and by whom therefore we have no reason to believe that any thing would or could be omitted, that may be supposed to have been of necessity to Salvation: Especially, when we also agree, what shall by and by be farther confirm'd, that their pens were directed by the Spirit of him whose story they took upon them to write. To all which if we add thirdly, the account that one of those Evangelists hath given of the subsequent Acts and Preachings of the Apostles, together with the several Epistles written by them to those Churches which they had founded, so we shall still find less reason to look beyond the Scriptures for an account of that Religion which they taught. Setting aside therefore all other Repositories of our Religion, we will enquire into the Authority of these, and shew them to have been written by men worthy of credit, yea by such as were divinely inspir'd.

Now though this therefore ought to be shewn concerning the Scriptures of the Old Testament as well as concerning the Scriptures of the New, Christianity, though it receiv'd a more distinct explication from the latter, yet having no mean footsteps in the other; Yet, because whatever account they may be supposed to give thereof, they are neither the *primary* nor *principal* repositories of our Religion, I shall content my self in the general

<sup>k</sup> Mat. 28. ult.

ral to observe, that they stand confirmed to us by the New, where if any where this Religion is to be found. For these being evinced to be of divine Authority, the other will be found to be of an equal one; if they bear such an Attestation to them. Now that the Scriptures of the New Testament attest to the truth and the divinity of the Old, will appear from innumerable places in them. They endeavour to prove from thence that our Saviour is the Messiah, they remit us to the<sup>1</sup> searching of those Scriptures for our satisfaction in it. They call them by the name of the Holy<sup>m</sup> Scriptures, they affirm them to have been given<sup>n</sup> by inspiration from God. More particularly they affirm this of the Prophets and David, and of those writings which were pen'd by them. For thus for the Prophets we have St. Paul affirming<sup>o</sup> that God spake by them in the Holy Scriptures, and particularly<sup>p</sup> by the Prophet *Isaias*; as St. Peter, that the Spirit of<sup>q</sup> Christ<sup>a</sup> prophesied by them, and that<sup>r</sup> no Prophecy of the Scripture came by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost: for David in like manner, St. Matthew<sup>t</sup>, that David in Spirit call'd Christ Lord, or as St. Mark<sup>u</sup> expresseth it, that David said by the Holy Ghost, The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand, &c. as St. Peter again<sup>v</sup>, that the Holy Ghost spake this Scripture by the mouth of David, for he was numbred with us, and had obtained part of this ministry; the former whereof are the very words of the hundredth and tenth Psalm, and the first verse; the latter; though not the words, yet the sense of the one and fortieth and the ninth verse. So that if the Scriptures of the New Testament be worthy of credit, those of the Old are no less, because receiving from thence an ample testimony to their truth, yea to their having been by inspiration from God. The only thing therefore to be particularly proved, is that the Scriptures of the New Testament were written by men, who were both worthy of credit, and divinely inspir'd, which I shall now prove by parts.

That they were written by men worthy of credit, will appear if we consider either the opportunity they had to inform themselves, or secondly their fidelity and integrity. I appeal for the former hereof to their living in or near that age in which our Saviour himself did; to their being of his attendants, or Disciples of those that were. For thus, that I may begin with the four Gospels, because they begin the New Testament, and are indeed the principal Pillars of our Faith, St. Matthew and St. John, whose two of those Gospels are, were our Saviours Disciples, and one of them, even St. John, a Disciple that lay in his bosom, and may therefore be presum'd to have been more than ordinarily acquainted with his mind by whom he was so beloved and caref'd. And though St. Mark and St. Luke cannot boast of the same intimacy, no nor yet of being his immediate Disciples, yet the former, even St. Mark receiv'd his relations from the mouth of St. Peter<sup>x</sup> whose Disciple and Interpreter he was, as the latter from those who<sup>y</sup> were eye and ear witnesses of our Saviour, and from whom therefore, as he himself speaks, he may be supposed to have receiv'd a perfect understanding of him. Of no less or rather of far greater account must those Acts of the Apostles be, which are entitled to the same St. Luke; he having been a Companion of St. Paul, whose Acts are principally recorded by him, and from whom he might also understand the other. From the Gospels and Acts pass we to the Epistles, which make up the greatest part of that which follows; where, who is there that sees not that as the greater part are St. Paul's, so he cannot be supposed to have wanted infor-

<sup>1</sup> John 5. 39.

<sup>m</sup> 2 Tim. 3.16.  
<sup>n</sup> Ib. ver. 16.

<sup>o</sup> Rom. 1. 2.

<sup>p</sup> A&T. 28. 25.

<sup>q</sup> 1 Pet. 1. 11.

<sup>r</sup> 2 Pet. 1. 21.

<sup>t</sup> Mat. 22. 43.

<sup>u</sup> Mar. 12. 36.

<sup>v</sup> A&T. 1. 16.17.

<sup>x</sup> Iren. adv.

<sup>y</sup> Her. li. 3. c. 1.

Post vero horum

discessum, Mar-

cus Discipulus

& interpres Pe-

tri & ipse que

a Petro annun-

ciata erant, per

scripta nobis

tradidit.

<sup>y</sup> Luke. i. 2, 30



mation as to the doctrine of that Jesus whom he preach'd? Because over and above his conversation with those who had seen him in the flesh, he had immediate revelations from God, and from him into whose service he was admitted. I hope I shall not be obliged to give an account of St. Peter and St. John's first Epistles, both because they were confessedly Apostles, and those Epistles as confessedly theirs: And for the other remaining pieces I shall reserve a particular place for them, because they have not been so universally own'd. It may suffice here to say, that, as to what concerns things necessary, they contain no other in them, than what may fairly be demonstrated from the other. I will not say any thing at present (how considerable soever that objection may seem) that for these mens being so far qualified to write, we have little other proof than their own testimonies. For beside that this is reputed no objection against Julius Caesar's relation of his own Acts abroad, or indeed of any other Historian who pretends to have been present at what he writes, if it be an objection, it is an objection against their fidelity and integrity, which accordingly I come now to confirm. For the evidencing whereof I shall desire it may be first considered, how it is possible to imagine those men unfaithful in their relations, who delivered a doctrine which is of all others the most contrary thereto? For look into the Old Testament, which these do both confirm and commend, and you shall there find <sup>a</sup> that we may not *speake wickedly for God*, nor *talk deceitfully for him*, that <sup>a</sup> *lying lips are an abomination to the Lord*, that <sup>b</sup> *none shall abide in Gods tabernacle but they that walk uprightly, and work righteousness, and speak the truth from their heart*. Look into the New, and you shall there also find that Christ whose story they decipher represented <sup>c</sup> as *the way, the truth and the life*, that Spirit which he promised his Disciples, as <sup>d</sup> *a spirit of truth* and which *should lead them into all truth*: On the other side the Devil, that evil Angel, represented as <sup>e</sup> *a liar and the father of lies*, and him, whose coming is after the working of Satan, even Anti-Christ, attended with *lying wonders* <sup>f</sup> and *all deceivableness of unrighteousness*. Lastly, you shall there find Precepts as express as may be <sup>g</sup> to *put away lying*, and *the lovers or makers of a lie* excluded out of Heaven. For *there shall in* <sup>h</sup> *no wise*, saith St. John, <sup>i</sup> *enter into the [New Jerusalem] any thing that defileth or worketh abomination, or maketh a lie*: And without, saith the same St. John <sup>i</sup>, *are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and Idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie*. Now is it possible to imagine, that they, who spake so much against lying and deceitfulness, should make up their Gospels and Epistles of nothing else? Especially, when they spake with so much indignation against it, and with so strong apprehensions of the baseness and unworthiness thereof? For though it be not unusual for men to speak against those vices of which they are in some measure guilty themselves, yet as that is never done but with intuition to some worldly advantage, which I shall shew the writers of the New Testament to have had no reason to hope; their speaking so much against lying could not but have been a strong temptation to all wise persons to make trial whether they were not guilty of it themselves, and so, instead of gaining repute to their Sect, they should only have alarmed the world to the examination, and consequently to the condemnation of it. For though the putting on the person of a true and holy man may help much toward the abusing of the world, yet experience teacheth us that when men do over-act that part, they do but betray themselves

selves and their own dear Hypocrisie. And it brings to my mind a passage of the late Archbishop of *Armagh*, in his Answer to *Monsieur de Milietiere*, that most men, when they see a man strip up his sleeves and make large promises of fair dealing, do usually suspect juggling. And therefore if the inventors of this supposed *fable of Christ* (as one of the Atheistical Popes term'd it) designed to impose, they would certainly have pretended less to truth and holiness than they did. But to stop the mouth of this calumny, I shall desire it may be remembered that the great crime objected against these men by the Heathen themselves was their simplicity. For that is enough, though not to prove their fidelity, yet to answer the objection, and shew they could never have had the wit to have invented so handsome a story. It would be considered secondly, that as the Pen-men of the New Testament employ'd their pains about a doctrine which of all others was most contrary to unfaithfulness, so they gave no small proof of their own fidelity, by that account which they left behind them, of the miscarriages of themselves, and others who had an equal interest in their Religion. For thus St. *Matthew*, who was one of our Saviours Disciples, sets down their shameful forsaking<sup>k</sup> of their Master when he was apprehended, though they had just before affirmed that they would dy with him rather than any way deny him; the baseness of *Judas*<sup>l</sup> one of the twelve in selling his Master to the Chief Priests, the cowardise and perjury<sup>m</sup> of St. *Peter*; as this last too, in such aggravating circumstances, that their greatest Enemies could not have made it look more foully, or more unfutably to his Religion and former large professions. For by how much the more contrary these and other such like actions were both to the profession of their Religion and the common sentiments of mankind, so much the more reason was there to have conceal'd them, if they had intended to have impos'd upon the world, and cheated it into a good opinion of themselves. Which therefore having not done, but on the contrary with all frankness acknowledg'd them, no other account can be given of it, than that they had a regard to truth in it, and therefore much more in the delivery of their Masters doctrine: It being not to be suppos'd they will lie in other things, whom a consideration of their own reputation will not tempt to the commission of it. But then if we consider in the third place the no visible advantage of their dealing deceitfully, no nor yet of any mans espousing that Religion which they taught; if we consider that it was a Religion for which they could look for nothing but persecution, and which, for some hundreds of years, they were forced to endure; So we shall find yet less reason to believe that the Pen-men thereof would have employ'd their talent of lying about it, or the world have so easily and readily receiv'd their writings. Which yet they were so fond of, as to make them the measure of their belief and practice, to listen to their advisers and discard all contrary ones; yea choose rather to sacrifice themselves, than deliver up those writings to their Enemies, who thought to have destroy'd both them and their Religion with them.

Now though what hath been said concerning the truth of these Scriptures and their Authors come not up to that divine Authority to which they do also pretend: yet as it is enough to shew the divinity of our Religion because so often attested to by them; so I have insisted the rather on it, because even thus much is hardly granted them, and the stories of *Livy* or *Thucydides* find more credit in the world than the Pen-men of the New Testament. From whence else comes it to pass that the Precepts

thereof are so little regarded, yea that so little regard is had to those gracious promises it contains? that every little fading pleasure tempts us to the violation of the former, that every momentary joy draws us into the contempt of the latter? For what could we do more, if we believ'd the New Testament to be a Fable, and the Pen-men of it but so many Impostors? Indeed where the temptation is strong and present, where we are threatned with Fire and Fagot if we do not renounce our Religion, or have the promise of a Kingdom if we do; it is not much to be wondred, that even they should be overcome who have some belief of what the Scriptures relate. But for men to offend God for a *piece of bread*, for a poor and inconsiderable satisfaction, to offend him by such sins as administer little pleasure to the Sinner, as the talking loosely and profanely certainly do not much; This cannot sure be done by those who have any belief of what the Scriptures relate, concerning either the fate of evil men, or the future portion of good: It being a certain and experienc'd truth, that men will avoid that which they believe for their disadvantage, unless something of much greater consideration draw them on to it. Thus, even in Christendom it self, there want not Infidels, beside those who make profession of it; and though the Scriptures be also the word of God (as I come now to shew) yet can they not obtain that belief which every common Author doth.

For the evidencing whereof, it may suffice, in a great measure, to reflect upon what hath been already said concerning the truth of the Scriptures. For as supposing the Scriptures to be true, we must also suppose it to have been so, that the Apostles were infallibly assisted by Gods Spirit; Partly because they were assur'd by our Saviour, that they should be *led by him into all truth*, and partly because we understand from thence that that Spirit was actually confer'd upon them; so we must therefore in like manner suppose that they were so assisted by him in those writings which were by them transmitted to the Church: These, as they were the more publick preaching, so requiring at least an equal assistance, because the standing Monuments of our Religion. But from hence it will also follow, that we are to look upon as dictated by that Spirit, such Books of the New Testament as were undoubtedly the Apostles; such as are in particular, the Gospels of St. *Matthew* and St. *John*, the undoubted Epistle of him and St. *Peter*, and by consequence all St. *Pauls* writings, which make up the greatest part of those Books which pretend to be divine. For being St. *Paul* was adopted into the rank of the Apostles, being he himself professeth that he was *inferiour* to none of them, it follows that he had the same assistance of Gods Spirit, and consequently that his writings are divine. And indeed as St. *Peter*, who in this to be sure was but equal with the rest, was so confident upon the presumption of his being Acted by Gods Spirit, as to call that deceitful answer which was given him by *Ananias* a lie to the Holy Ghost, and to God; So there is nothing more frequent with St. *Paul* than to deliver what he writes as the dictates of Gods Spirit to him: Witness his prefixing almost before every Epistle his being *an Apostle by the will of God*, his affirming himself to deliver those things which he had receiv'd, and lastly, if he interpose any thing of his own, his accurate distinguishing it from the *Commandments* of the Lord, which shews the remainder of his writings to have been the undoubted Issue of that Spirit, by which he was so signally inspired. All therefore that remains to be accounted for, are St. *Mark* and St. *Lukes* Writings,

\* 1 Cor. 7. 10.  
12.





# The Father.

## The Contents.

*Of the true notion of the word Father, whereby is shewn that we ought to understand his communicating from all eternity his own divine essence to the Son. This evidenced by such proofs as do more directly establish that Paternity; where moreover is shewn, what the consequences thereof are in respect of God and his Son, as also in respect of our adoration of them. The same Paternity evidenced by such proofs as establish a Trinity of persons in the Godhead, which is shewn out of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. An essay toward the evidencing in some measure, how all this agrees with that Unity of the Godhead, which both reason and Scripture oblige us to believe.*

### The Fa- ther.

<sup>a</sup> Introd. to the  
Explication of  
the Apostles  
Creed.

<sup>b</sup> Mat. 1. 20.

Τὸ ὅδ' ἐστὶν  
γεννηθὲν ἐκ  
πνεύματος ἁγίου

ἡσυχίας. See

also Luc. 1. 35.

where, in respect

to this miracu-

lous conception,

it is affirmed

that he should

be called the Son

of God.

<sup>c</sup> Joh. 10. 35,

36.

<sup>d</sup> Act. 13. 32,

33.

<sup>e</sup> Phil. 2. 6, 7.

<sup>f</sup> Est ergo Deus

Pater verus ve-

ritatis pater, non

extrinsecus cre-

ans, sed ex eo

quod ipse est fi-

lius generans;

id est, quia sa-

piens sapienti-

am, quia iustus

iustitiam, quia

simpiternus sem-

piternum, quia

immortalis im-

mortalem, quia

invisibilis in-

visibilem, quia

lux splendorem,

quia mens ver-

bum. Expof. in

Symb.

**T**O go on now, according to my proposed method, with the *Explication of the Creed*, and where we shall soon see a necessity of laying other Foundations of our Faith, than what our own reason will suggest. For though that may prompt us to look upon God as a *Father*, because giving being unto all things, but more especially in respect of man, to whom, over and above a being, he imparts of his own image; yet will it not furnish us with any proofs of his being the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom, as was before shewn <sup>a</sup>, this Paternity of his is here restrain'd. For though God be also the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ in respect of his miraculous Conception in the Womb, as by virtue of whose Spirit he was conceiv'd or <sup>b</sup> begotten in it; though he may be said to be so also in respect of that Authority, wherewith he invested him, this giving those upon whom it is conferr'd the name of *Gods*, and how much more then, as our Saviour argu'd <sup>c</sup>, that of the Son of God to him who was so signally sanctified and commissioned by him; Lastly, though God may be said to be his Father in respect of that new birth he gave him from the Womb of his Mother Earth, and from which, through the power of God, he was rais'd to an immortal life; it being with reference to that, that St. Paul applies to him <sup>d</sup> that known passage of the Psalmist, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*: Yet I conceive God here said to be his Father, because communicating to him from all eternity his own divine Essence; and by which as the Scripture speaks <sup>e</sup>, he not only became in the form of God, but to such a degree as not to think it *any robbery to be equal with him*. I alledge for the proof hereof, its being so interpreted by him, who, first of all those that are come unto our hands, undertook an Explication of the Creed. For God, saith Rufinus <sup>f</sup>, where he descants upon this Article, *is a true father, and the father of truth, not creating the Son of any thing from without, but begetting him of that which he himself is, and after his own similitude and image in all things; that is to say, as he is wise producing wisdom in him, as he is just righteousness, making him eternal, immortal,*

and invisible as he himself is, producing splendor in him by his light, and making him the word of his divine intellect. But what speak I of *Ruffinus*, or of the presumption that may thence be made of the sense of the Ancient Church concerning it, when it appears from the *Nicene* and *Constantinopolitan* Creed, that the same was the sense of the universal, than which what greater proof can be desir'd? For explaining the descent of our Saviour from God, by his being *begotten by him before all worlds, God of God and light of light*, they shew the sonship spoken of in the Creed to be that by which our Saviour had the Divine Nature communicated to him, and consequently that in that sense we are here to understand God to be his Father. As indeed, why otherwise should the *Arians*, whom it concern'd so nearly to impugn this Paternity and that Sonship, why should they, I say, when coming to speak of the descent of our Saviour represent him as *begotten by God before all worlds, and as one by whom all things were made*? Nay why should they not have gone roundly to work, as the *Socinians* have since done, and deny'd him to have had any being antecedent to his conception by the *Virgin Mary*? But that they saw well enough, that the Faith of the Church, as well as the Doctrine of the Scriptures, delivered another kind of Paternity and Sonship, than that which our modern Hereticks are willing to allow? Though if all, that hath been hitherto alledg'd, be not enough to evince this sense, I hope the evidencing of such a relation from the Scriptures will: It being not to be thought that so considerable a truth would be left out in a summary of Faith.

\* See the confession of Faith exhibited by Arius and Euzoius to the Emperor Constantine. Socr. Hist. Eccl. li. i. c. 26. As also those which were afterwards framed by Arius or his followers, and which do all allow of another Paternity and Sonship, than that which is founded in the conception of our Saviour by the Virgin Mary.

Now there are two sorts of proofs which perswade that Paternity whereof we speak, and which we have said to have been intended by the Creed; whereof the former respects this Father and him of whom he is affirmed to be so, the latter the Trinity of persons in the Godhead. For if as the Christian Church hath always maintain'd, there be three that command in Heaven, as well as bear record there, either they must be said to have been independent of each other for their Divinity, which will necessarily infer a plurality of Gods, or one of them must be supposed to have communicated his Godhead to the other two, according as the same Church hath declared. Which though it will not come up to a full proof of God's Paternity, because he communicates his Divine Nature to the third person, as well as the second, whom Christianity allows us not to call his Son, yet will establish that Divine Communication which is the principal ground thereof, and together therewith be a good preparatory to the unfolding of that mysterious nature, which here and hereafter I shall find my self obliged to entreat of.

To begin with those proofs which do more directly respect that Paternity, which is the subject of our present consideration; where first I shall call in to my assistance that account which *St. John* gives us of our Saviour under the notion of the *Word*, which is a title by which he both there and elsewhere calls him. For affirming this *Word* to have been *God* as well as *with God*, to have been *in the beginning with God* and to have given being to all things made, which is as clear a proof of his Divinity as can be desir'd; affirming moreover, when he comes to speak of this *Word* dwelling among them, that they beheld his *Glory, the Glory as of the only begotten of the Father*: he plainly intimates the *Glory* of the *Word* to have been the *Glory* of the only begotten of the Father, and consequently that as he was the *Word* he was the only begotten of God and



and receiv'd his Divine Nature from him. For though the word *as* (*and we beheld his glory the glory as of the only begotten of the Father*) may seem to be some diminution to this inference, because denoting rather a similitude to the Glory of the only begotten, than that his Glory was the Glory of him: Yet inasmuch as neither St. *John* nor any of the Writers of the New Testament acquaint us with any other only begotten than that word whereof he speaks, the meaning thereof can be no other, than that that Glory of the Word which they beheld was a Glory well becoming

<sup>b</sup> Chrysostom.

in John 1. 14.

Τὸ δὲ ὧς ὡς

ταύτα, οὐχ

ὁμοιωσά-

ναι, ἀλλὰ

ἐκβασι-

λεως ὡς

καὶ ἀναμ-

νησίου τοῦ

ὡς. ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

καὶ ὡς

<sup>b</sup> that singular nature which he receiv'd from that his Father God. Of the same nature I should think (and more than that I will not add here; because I must resume this argument when I come to entreat of this his *only Son*) of the same nature, I say, I should think his affirming so roundly, that all things \* whatsoever the Father had were his, yea even those things which were to be dispens'd to the Church by Gods Spirit, his praying that as he came forth from the Father so he would glorify him with himself with the Glory he had with him before the World was. For what can this signifie less to unprejudiced minds, than that as he partook of the same perfections and Glories from all Eternity, so he deriv'd them from him whom he here entitles Father, and to whom he therefore prays that he may be restor'd to the lustre of them?

The Paternity of God being thus confirm'd by such proofs as do more directly establish it, it cannot but be thought reasonable, provided it be done with sobriety, to reflect upon the consequences thereof, whether it be upon the part of this Father and his Son, or upon the part of us who are to acknowledge and adore them. For from hence it will appear first, that there is a preeminence on the part of the Father, because communicating that Divine Nature, which the Son hath, unto him. Which is so true, that it is not only avowed by the Fathers <sup>k</sup> of the Church, by whom he is moreover stil'd the Root and Fountain of the Godhead, but so far owned by the Scriptures, that the name of God is sometime set to denote and distinguish him from those, who partake with him of the same Divine Nature. For thus, to omit other places, we find St. *Paul* <sup>l</sup> using it, where he prays that *the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the communion of the Holy Ghost* should be with all those *Corinthians* to whom he wrote: The express mention of the other two persons of the Trinity before and after making it necessary to understand the *First* there, as that that first was not without some preeminency above the other, from whom he is distinguish'd only by the name of *God*. It will follow secondly from that Paternity, and the preeminency that it involves, that it is not at all incongruous for the Father to send this his Son upon any errand that may be worthy of him, and but meet for that Son when sent to go: Because, though they both partake of the Divine Nature, yet the latter only by communication from the former, and to whom therefore he must so far forth be supposed to be inferior. Whence it is that, as we read so often of his *sending* both this Son and the common Spirit of them both, so we find the same Son so readily complying with the intimations of his will, yea though that will was no other than that he should *empty* himself, and both assume to himself the form of a Servant, and become obedient to the death of the Cross in it. A thing which he did not only declare by his actions, but if we may believe the Psalmist <sup>m</sup>, by a verbal declaration of it. For observing (as the Author to the *Hebrews* <sup>n</sup> remarks out of him) that God delighted not in burnt-offerings,

<sup>k</sup> Armin. in Epist. ad Hippol. à Collibus. Pearson upon the Creed.

<sup>l</sup> 2 Cor. 13. 14.

<sup>m</sup> Psal. 40. 6.

<sup>n</sup> Heb. 10. 5,

6, 7.

ferings, as who aim'd at a far better sacrifice and which moreover he had fitted him with a Body for, the consideration thereof prompted him when he came into the World to say *Loe I come to do thy will O God.* So sensible was this Son himself of the congruity of complying with him, from whom he receiv'd his Divinity, and then I hope it will be no error in us either to take notice of it, or acknowledge it; especially, when it is in a manner necessary to shew the Wisdom and Justice of that Oeconomy by which our redemption was effected: It being not to be imagin'd, there should be any thing like *willing* on the one side and *compliance* on the other, where there is not something of imparity in the subjects of it. Now as where there is such a difference between the persons to be ador'd, it is but reasonable that a difference should be made in the adoration that is to be paid; So the difference between the Father and the Son consisting not in their Nature, which is equally Divine and Glorious in both, but in the manner of their coming to it, which in the Father is from himself or rather from none, but in the Son from the Father, we are accordingly to conceive of the one as the Fountain of light, of the other, as the Author to the *Hebrews* speaks, as an ἀνὰ γὰρ or beaming <sup>Heb. 1. 3</sup> from it; With this only difference (because there is nothing in nature by which it can be any other than obscurely resembled) that this ἀνὰ γὰρ or beaming is every way equally Glorious with the Fountain, and differs only from it, that it receives its origination from it. And though the whole three persons are Fountains and principles in respect of us, and of all those whether Temporal or Spiritual mercies which we enjoy; yet as he who is the Fountain of the Divinity, must be so in a more eminent manner in respect of us, so we are accordingly to conceive of him as the πρῶτος ἀρχὴ or *former first* fountain of created things, as of the Son that he receives his being, a fountain from the Father, and the Holy Ghost from both. But because adoration though it begin in the mind, yet doth not terminate there, as being made up of outward acknowledgements as well as of internal conceptions, therefore, to shew the difference that ought to be made in our adoration, we are to consider of those acknowledgments, and shew how they ought to be made so, as to preserve the distinction that is between them, and yet secure the honour that is due unto them all upon the account of their partaking alike of the same Divine and Glorious Nature. In order whereunto, we are first of all carefully to observe, that there is no species of outward or inward adoration which is not common to them all. For the Divine Nature, which is the ground of our adoration, being common to the Son and the Holy Ghost with that Father from whom they receiv'd it, we are of necessity to give unto each of them the several species of that Adoration by which the Divine Nature is acknowledged. Whence it is that, in a Vision which was represented unto *St. John* <sup>Rev. 5. 13</sup>, we find all the creatures of the World brought in saying, *Blessing and honour and glory and power be unto the lamb for ever and ever, as well as unto him that sitteth upon the throne.* It would be as carefully observed secondly, that as the several species of Adoration ought to be given to each of the three persons, because all partaking of the same Divine Nature; so ought they to be paid to the Son and Holy Ghost with the same affections and submissiveness wherewith they are paid unto the Father: This being but due to the perfections of the Divine Nature whereof they do in like manner partake. So far therefore to be sure there ought to be no difference in our religious acknowledgments, and therefore the distinction that is be-

tween the Father and the other not so to be declar'd. And indeed as the preeminency there is upon the part of the Father is not upon the account of his being more God than the Son or the Holy Ghost, but upon the account of his communicating that their Divinity to them; so there are other ways by which that preeminence may be acknowledg'd, without any entrenching upon the other. Of which nature I reckon first, because the most natural acknowledgment of it, the giving him the precedence in our nomination; as we do, even by the command of our Saviour, when we baptize *in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost*, or when, agreeably to the practice of the Church, we give *glory to the Father*, before we do it *to the Son and Holy Ghost*, in that *Doxology* which was intended to secure the equal honour of them all. But because how proper soever that acknowledgment may be thought to be, yet it appears from St. Paul that it is not necessary to be always observed, he, where he implores the blessing of the Deity upon the

<sup>2</sup> Cor. 13. 14. *Corinthians*, postponing <sup>a</sup> *the love of the Father to the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ*; therefore I think it but just to add, that, where the former order is not observ'd, it is but requisite that some amends be made for it, either by such a character of the Father as may shew him to be considered as he ought (for thus the same St. Paul doth in the place before quoted, because making use of no other name than that of God to distinguish him from the other persons) or by such an account of those other persons, as may shew them, how divine soever, to act from and under him. For so (to go no farther than the forementioned Apostle) St. Paul where he attributes the work of creation both to the Father and the Son, tells us concerning the former <sup>r</sup> *that of him are all things and we in him*, but

<sup>1</sup> Cor. 8. 6.

of the latter that *by him are all things and we by him*; thereby plainly intimating, that though the Son had an interest in that omnipotent work of the creation, yet it was from and under him of whom *all things* are there said to be: That as it is the only good account that can be given of the particle *by*, so being yet farther confirm'd by the Author to the *Hebrews* <sup>r</sup> where he tells us that God even the Father *made the worlds by him*. More I doubt not might be said to this purpose, and consistently enough with the allowed practice of the Church, as well as with the Catholick Doctrine of the Trinity which I shall by and by make it my business to establish. But as what I have already said may suffice to preserve that preeminence which I have affirm'd to be due unto the Father, so I had much rather make an end here than either be misapprehended or misinterpreted, which in so ticklish an argument as this it will be almost impossible to avoid.

<sup>1</sup> Heb. 1. 2.

<sup>a</sup> Having thus given an account of such proofs of Gods Paternity as do more directly establish it, having moreover shewn what the consequences of that Paternity are, as well in respect of us as in respect of God; proceed we to shew that there are three persons that partake alike of the Divine Nature, which I have said, though indirectly, to establish it. For though the name and relation of Father oblige us to look no farther than the Son, as in respect of whom alone he is so stil'd; yet, as that communication of the Divine Nature, by which he becomes a Father, is, though in another way, affirm'd to have been made by him to the Holy Ghost, and cannot therefore but be thought to be proper enough to be consider'd here, so both that and the other will be so much the more firmly established, if we can make it appear that there are three persons that



that partake alike of the Divine Nature: The unity of the Godhead being not in any tolerable measure to be salv'd, unless it be resolv'd into one certain principle, and from whom those others, that pretend to it, may be suppos'd to have deriv'd it. Now to make it appear that there are three persons that partake alike of the Divine Nature, and so, as was said of the second, are both *God* and *with God*, seems to me to be so clear from a passage of *St. John*, that that alone, if well established, will sufficiently evince it. For affirming, as he doth, 'that *there are three that bear record in Heaven*, and that those three are *the father, the word, and the Holy Ghost*; affirming moreover, that *these three are one, or one thing*, as the original Greek expresseth it, he leaveth no place for doubt, either of their being three *persons*, or of their partaking of *one and the same Divine Nature*. Not of the former, because the Father and the Word are certainly persons, and therefore the like to be believed concerning the Holy Ghost, as who is not only joyned with them, but affirmed afterwards to be *one* with them: As neither of the latter, because the Father is as certainly God, and therefore the like to be presum'd of the Word and Holy Ghost, as who are affirmed to be one or one thing with him. The only thing that can be suppos'd to take off from the force of it, is that *that* unity which is predicated of them, refers rather to the record they are affirmed to bear, than to any unity of Essence or Nature. But beside that *that* or any other like diminutive sense, cannot be put upon a like expression of our Saviour, where he affirms him and his Father to be *one* or *one thing*, the Jews, to whom it was spoken, interpreting it to be no other than that he made himself God by it; beside that there is no necessity at all of understanding an unity of testimony here, because though that be the thing primarily aim'd at by *St. John*, it is sufficiently made out by the unity of their Essence; Neither can the expression made use of be suppos'd capable of such an interpretation, nor if it were, can any account be given of *St. John's* changing the phrase in the next verse, where it is confess'd that the unity of their testimony is intended. It is true indeed, if *St. John* had said, and these three are *one* or *unus*, that is to say if he had put the word *one* in the Masculine Gender, so it might fairly enough have been apply'd to the *disciples* before spoken of, or to the word *adelphoi* that might be understood in the Participle *μαρτυροῦντες*, and so also the sense thereof have been, and these three are *one* or *agreeing* in their testimony, or these three are *as one witness*. But as there is not the like agreement between either of them and the word *ἐν*, as which is of the Neuter Gender, so that word signifying properly *one thing* will more reasonably be understood of an unity in Essence than it can of an unity in Testimony. And though I know, they, who would willingly elude this place, think themselves not a little strengthen'd by *St. John's* affirming in the following verse of the Witnesses on earth, that *those three agreed in one* or *tended to the same purpose*, yet it seems to me rather to prejudice than advantage them. For beside that *St. John* was not ignorant, from the interpretation the Jews before made of it, that this expression was likely enough to be construed in another sense, and should therefore in reason have avoided it, when he had a more inoffensive one at hand to express his mind; Why should he, when to express the same thing in the next verse, make use of another phrase than what he before did? For though, among Men whose business is language, such kind of changes are affected, yet the like is not to be

thought to have been by a man of St *John's* simplicity and gravity ; Especially, when the retaining of his old phrase in this latter verse, as well as in the former, would have taken off from that ill interpretation that was likely enough to be put upon it. For had he affirm'd of the witnesses on earth, *and these three are one or one thing* also, the other sense would not have been so easily taken up, because it is certain that those witnesses on earth could not be suppos'd to be any other way *one* than in that testimony which they bore. Being therefore that sense, which is put upon the words by the Church, is the most proper and literal one ; being there is no necessity at all of interpreting it of an unity in testimony, nor indeed, considering the expression it self, and the change that was afterwards made, any probability of understanding it ; he must be a Man of a perverse as well as an erroneous mind, who shall deny it to have that force which it is commonly supposed to be of. And indeed as the adversaries of the Trinity may seem to have been of the same mind, because taking care to have it thought no part of the Text ; so it is no doubt the best of their Plea, and the Text may better be denied than answered ; because it is certain that *that* verse or part of it is wanting in several

\* See the Vari-  
antes Lect.  
Græc. Novi  
Test. in the  
6 Vol. of the  
Biblia Polyglot.

Greek Copies <sup>a</sup> and in some versions out of them. But beside that there is no very good accord between those whether Originals or Versions that wanted it, some wanting more and some less, which is a great prejudice against them all ; Beside that the present reading hath the Authority of many ancient and all but one printed copy of the Greek ; Beside, lastly, that the omission might at first have hapned by the mistake of the Scribe, who having transcrib'd in the copy before him as far as the first *for there are three that bear witness*, his eye might by error leap over what is in

\* Annot. in loc.

the midst, and so pass, as Dr. *Hammond* <sup>a</sup> hath shewn, to the *witnesses on earth*, even the water the Spirit and the Blood : Beside all these things, neither can the foisting of this verse in be supposed to have been by chance, nor yet to have come to pass by the fraud of the Catholics ; partly, because, as the same learned Man hath shewn at large, the doctrine of the Trinity needed it not, and partly because it had a place in the Bible before the great controversy between the Church and *Arim*. For

<sup>b</sup> Dicit dominus, Ego & Pater unum sumus : & iterum de Patre & Filio & Spiritu sancto scriptum est, Et hi tres unum sunt.

<sup>c</sup> Advers. Paxeam, c. 25. Qui tres unum sunt.

thus St. *Cyprian* in his Tract *de unitate Ecclesiæ* <sup>b</sup>, *The Lord saith, I and the father are one ; and again, It is written concerning the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, And these three are one* : As *Tertullian* <sup>c</sup> in like manner where he speaks before of these three persons, *which three are one*. Testimonies, these latter ones, which seem to me to be of greater force, than those copies, were they more than they are, where this verse is affirmed to be wanting : As because of the authority the Author thereof had in the Church, and therefore freely and without any hesitation alledging this now so controverted Text ; so because they are more ancient than any Manuscript copies wherein it is wanting, and so far as I can learn also, than the mention of that want in any. In the mean time, we may thank God that this passage was not inserted into any of those Epistles of St. *John*, of the genuineness whereof there was sometime a doubt in the Church. For then it is likely enough that *Socinus* and his followers, who affirm this verse to have been certainly supposititious, might for the sake thereof have sent those Epistles and their fellowes packing ; But however that *Socinus* himself would not have so strenuously asserted the authority of them and of the other Scriptures, as it must be confessed <sup>d</sup> that he hath.

<sup>d</sup> In libro cui titulus, Auctoritas Scriptura.

The foundation of our belief of a Trinity being thus firmly laid, proceed

ceed we to enquire what other evidences there are of it in the Scriptures, whether they be those that have the name of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, or those which are call'd the Scriptures of the New. This only would be premis'd concerning the former, what appears from the doctrine of those Scriptures as well as from those of the New Testament, that it being not the intention of God to make so clear a discovery of himself then, as he hath since made under the New, we are not to expect so clear a discovery of the mystery of the Trinity there, as which may not stand in need of some explication from the New Testament; and to which therefore I shall ever and anon have recourse for the elucidation of it. Now as the book of *Genesis* is the first of those that gives beginning to the Scriptures of the Old Testament, so it will not be difficult for us to discern even there many fair indications of it. Of this nature I reckon first, the *plurality* of that name by which this eternal God is in the very entrance of that book denoted, as again the same God's speaking in the plural number when he saith, *let us make man in our image and after our likeness*. For though I know it be commonly said both by the Jewish Rabbins and our own, that the latter of these is but after the mode of great persons, who, for the aggrandizing of themselves, are wont to speak of themselves in the plural number; though I know that it is in like manner affirmed by them, that of names in the plural number there want not examples in other places even when attributed to a single person: Yet, as it must be acknowledged that those examples in other particulars are exceeding rare, and so of less consideration; so both the one and the other exception will be of yet less force, if there be other passages in the text which incline those modes of speech to the signification of a Trinity. Now that there are other passages in the Text, and those too not far remov'd from these, which incline these expressions to that sense, I shall ask no other of any man toward the evincing of than an unprejudiced mind, and the consideration of these following ones. For is there not express mention in the second Verse of that first Chapter of the Third of these divine persons? Hath he not the name of the *spirit of God*, by which he is entitled in the New Testament, and, to let us see his interest in the great work of the Creation, affirmed too *to move upon the face of the waters*, that so things, which by their former confusion were before of no form or comeliness, might be orderly digested, and each creature, which was then made, have its proper place? For to interpret all this of a *great wind* as some of the Rabbins do, beside the disproportionableness thereof to so great an effect, and the airs not being at that time separated, and so no wind; We understand by *Job*<sup>f</sup>, if we dare understand any thing in a literal sense, that God by his own *spirit garnished the heavens*. And though there be not the like mention of the *Word* the second of those divine persons which Christianity calls upon us to own, yet from those words, *And God said let there be light, and there was light*, the Jews have collected that there was such a person as the *Word* by whom God made the World, as appears from *Philo* and the *Chaldee Paraphrase*. Which yet is no more than what the Psalmist did where he saith that by the word<sup>h</sup> of the Lord were the heavens made, and after him *St. John*,<sup>i</sup> *for all things were made by him*, even by the word before spoken of, and without him was not anything made that was made. Lastly, alluding to what the Devil had said to our first Parents, that, if they eat of the forbidden fruit, they should be as *Gods knowing good and evil*, we find

<sup>e</sup>Exod. 22. 11.  
Et accipiet do-  
mini ejus pro  
dominus, nem-  
pe rei contro-  
verse.  
Ila. 19. 4.  
Tradam Agy-  
ptum in manum  
dominorum  
duri.

<sup>f</sup>Job 26. 13:

<sup>i</sup>Vid. Hug.  
Grot. Annot.  
ad Joh. 1. 1:  
<sup>h</sup>Psal. 33. 6.  
<sup>i</sup>John 1. 3.



<sup>1</sup> Gen. 3. 22.<sup>2</sup> Dial. cum

Tryph. p. 285.

<sup>1</sup> Prov. 8. 23.

Ec.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Pet. 3. 5.<sup>3</sup> Heb. I. 2. 3.

find God though ironically saying, Behold the Man is become *as one*<sup>1</sup> of us, knowing good and evil; which as *Justin Martyr* well observes<sup>2</sup>, doth at least infer a *duality of persons*, and inclines us to believe that of *let us make man in our image after our likeness*, to be an address of the Father to the other two persons; that of becoming *like one of us* being an expression that never any Prince made use of, with reference to himself, or can indeed fit the mouth of any single person whatsoever. If it be yet further said, as a Jew will not easily yield, nor it may be, through their converse, those who have been trading in that kind of literature, if it be yet farther said, that this was spoken to the *Angels*, who may well enough be supposed to have been created before this time, I would demand both of the Jew and the Judaizer, what other grounds he hath for it besides his own fond surmise, nay whether or no it be *Σοφισμὸς*; thus to make God speak to the Angels as his fellows? Especially when we learn from the book of Proverbs<sup>1</sup> that there was a thing call'd *Wisdom*, and which by the general consent of the Antients is interpreted of the Word, that was not only *set up by God from everlasting*, and *before ever the earth was*, or *the heavens were prepar'd*, but *stood by him* also when he gave being to them, and was then and *always Gods delight*. Though if that Text, because of the indefiniteness of its expressions, might not serve to convince a Jew, yet methinks a Christian, who hath receiv'd a clearer insight into this affair, might be a little startled by that, and those many Scriptures of the New Testament, which affirm that all things were made by that word which Christianity depredicates, that by the same *λόγος*<sup>2</sup> or word the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water, and, which is yet more definite and clear, that *God made the worlds by his Son*, even by that Son, as the Author to the Hebrews speaks<sup>3</sup>, by whom he hath in these last days spoken unto us, and by whom our attonement is procur'd. For to whom can we more reasonably suppose the former speeches address'd, than to those who then *stood by him*, and whose ministry he made use of in the framing of the World? From that first Chapter of *Genesis* pass we to the eighteenth and nineteenth of the same, for beyond the book it self we shall not need: In the former whereof we find one of those three Angels that appeared unto *Abraham* (for that they were at least of an Angelical Nature none doubts, though in the appearance of Men, and is evident from *Genesis* the nineteenth and the first) stil'd by the name of *Jehovah* or Lord. For so verse the thirteenth, *And Jehovah or the Lord said unto Abraham, wherefore did Sarah laugh?* And verse the two and twentieth of the same Chapter, *And the men turned their faces from thence, and went toward Sodom*, that is to say, *two of them*, as appears from the nineteenth Chapter and the first verse, *but Abraham stood yet before the Lord*. Here I say it is manifest, that one of these Angels is stil'd by the name of *Jehovah* or Lord, which must be either some created Angel sustaining the person of God, or the second person of the Trinity. Not the first, as may appear both by the name *Jehovah*, and his and *Abrahams* carriage throughout this whole Chapter: The Lord here spoken of speaking as one who had power either to save or destroy, and *Abraham* accordingly addressing himself to him as *the Judge* of all the Earth, *for that be far from thee to do after this manner, to slay the righteous with the wicked, shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?* Now if he, who is here stil'd by the name of *Jehovah*, or Lord, was no created Angel, then was it either God the Father

Father, or some other person of the Trinity. Not God the Father, for supposing those to have been Angels or Messengers, by whom should they be sent? And secondly this Lord, whoever he was, was distinguished from another in heaven. For so verse the four and twentieth we find it said, that *the Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrha brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven.* What Lord trow we, but *that Lord* who appeared unto *Abraham*, and told him that *he would go down* to the plain where *Sodom and Gomorrha* stood, and *see whether they had done according to the cry of their sins*, and as he said undoubtedly did? Which interpretation is yet more to be valued, because the Son of God, who may most probably be supposed to be this Lord, as by whose thus early appearing in the shape of a Man, an indication was given to the World of his more manifestly appearing afterwards in the flesh, is by the Author to the *Hebrews* <sup>o</sup> affirm'd to have been God's in- <sup>o</sup> Heb. 1. 3. strument in the upholding of the World, as well as in the creating of it; as by *himself* <sup>p</sup> to work the works of a more beneficial providence, as <sup>p</sup> John 5. 17. well as his Father God; there being little reason to deny him an instrumentality in the works of a punitive one, to which the other is committed. One thing only there is, and at which I confess, I was sometime startled, because I found the learned *Grotius* employing it against this opinion: I mean the Author to the *Hebrews* <sup>q</sup> affirming that God hath spok- <sup>q</sup> Heb. 1. 1. en to us in these last days *by his Son* as a way of address which he did not before use, and for which therefore he would seem to intimate, that we ought to think our selves so much the more obliged to him. But considering with my self that the opposition by him made is not between Gods speaking and not speaking at all by his Son, but between Gods speaking to the Fathers by the Prophets, and his now speaking unto us by his Son, I soon saw that no other sense could be put upon that affirmation of the Apostle, than that, whereas God did before employ *mere men*, though *inspir'd*, in the delivery of his will, he now resolv'd to make *his own Son*, and of whom so glorious things are there declar'd, his Prophet and Interpreter, and accordingly fitted him with a humane body to converse with mankind, and both sanctified him and sent him into the world. And though I know the *Ancient Fathers*, by whom these arguments are employ'd, be now of less esteem than heretofore, upon a presumption of a greater stock of learning belonging to the present age; yet, as he who shall carefully peruse their writings or arguments will not find them to be strangers to any Divine or Humane literature, so they had this great advantage above the age we live in, that as they liv'd much nearer to the Apostles times, so tradition in their times was more fresh and sincere, and they thereby enabled to arrive at the meaning of some Scriptures, which we, without their help, should not have been able to penetrate into.

Now as, after the evidences of the Old Testament, it is but reasonable we should consider of the New, as where to be sure we may discern much clearer ones; so we shall no sooner enter into the Scriptures of that, but we shall find these three persons, to wit at the Baptism of our Saviour. The Father in a voice, for *loe, a voice from heaven, saying, this* <sup>Mat. 3. 16, 17.</sup> *is my beloved son in whom I am well pleased*, the Spirit of God descending in the shape of a Dove, or rather adumbrating his own influences by it, and the Son illustrated and witnessed to by them both. If we pass from thence to St. *John's* Gospel, as which indeed is the chief Store-house of

of this sacred treasure, beside what we meet with in the beginning of it, that *in the beginning was the word, and the word was both God and with God*, we shall find our Saviour affirming that *he and his Father were one, or one thing*, and praying that *God would glorify him with that glory which he had with him before the world was*, which to be sure, because before the creation of all things, could be no other than divine. Lastly, we shall find him speaking of the spirit of God as of a person, and if so, then a person in the Deity, because divine. But because the best way to prove the Trinity out of the New Testament, must be by shewing from thence that the *Son* or *Word* is God, and that the Holy Ghost is so too, both of which will fall in more seasonably when I come to handle those Articles that respect them, I will content my self at present with those fair intimations of it in the Old Testament, and that express affirmation of St. *John*, which I have before so largely insisted on concerning their being *three and one*. And though I will not therefore urge that *Doxology* of the four beasts in the *Revelations*, as a proof of the ever blessed Trinity, *Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord, God, Almighty*; yet as I cannot think a better reason can be assign'd of repeating the word *Holy* three several times than because there were three persons in the Godhead whom they ador'd, so I cannot but take occasion from thence to invite you to the adoration of them for the signal benefits you receive from them: It being not so much the right apprehension of the Trinity that will endear us thereunto, as the cordial acknowledgement of their favours and the conforming of our lives to their blessed directions and commands.

[Rev. 4. 8.]

But because it may be demanded how all this agrees with that unity of the Godhead, which reason as well as Scripture obligeth us to acknowledge, and because no place can be so proper for the resolution of that, as this Article of Gods Paternity, because ever look'd upon as the best foundation of the unity, therefore I will make it my business to enquire, so far as the Scriptures will enable me, how this unity of the Godhead may be sav'd. For to attempt the doing thereof by the principles of reason, or indeed wholly to reconcile a Trinity in unity to them, is a thing which could never yet enter in my head, nor am I desirous that it should: Partly, because of the inextricable difficulties wherewith it is attended, and partly, because I have ever thought he knows God less than he ought and may, who thinks he may be comprehended by him. Only as nothing hinders we should make the belief of it as easy as we can, lest otherwise we should be tempted to deny it, so it is not impossible, unless we enquire into it, we may entertain other conceptions of it, than either Nature or Scripture will allow. For the avoiding whereof, as well as for the establishing the doctrine of Christianity and the Church we are to consider that *Godhead*, which we affirm to be one, either as connoting its being from none, or abstracting from it. If we consider the Godhead in the former of these senses, so, even by the principles of Christianity, it is not only one, but so *one* as to be proper only to the Father. For beside that that declares the Godhead of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost to have been deriv'd to them from him, and consequently that that Godhead which is common to them with the Father doth not connote the being from none, the *Nicene Creed*, which was intended as an explication of this, restrains the attribute of one God unto the Father, as St. *Paul* where he establisheth the unity of the Godhead against the multiplicity of heathen ones,



ones, affirms, even in contradistinction to our Saviour whom he afterwards entitleth Lord, that *to us there is but one God, even the Father of whom are all things and we in him.* And indeed, as this is an unity, which ought therefore to be carefully distinguished from that unity of the Godhead which is common to the three persons, so ought it no less carefully to be heeded, because it secures us in a great measure from the fear of Polytheism, which is that we are now endeavouring to avoid: He, who maintains that there is but one divine person who is from none, thereby acknowledging but one first principle from which all other things are deriv'd. Having thus considered the Godhead as connoting the being from none, in which sense we have shewn it to be peculiar to the Father, proceed we to consider it as abstracting from that notion, as Christianity doth manifestly oblige us: That, how carefully soever it assert the Son and Holy Ghost's being God, yet as carefully maintaining that they derive that Godhead from the Father. Now in this sense there is no doubt from Christianity of their being three persons and one God, nor yet, supposing the principles thereof, of the consistency of that Trinity and Unity: As because they are affirm'd to be one not in personality but in essence, so because that essence, by virtue whereof they become one, is affirmed to be communicated from the Father, in whom it originally resides, to the second and third persons in the Trinity. By which means, the difficulty of this great mystery is resolv'd in fine into the possibility of the Fathers communicating his essence to the other two. Now though that be a difficulty, which I shall not pretend to assail, because I must acknowledge it to be above my ability, yet can I not see any reason why it may not be so far digested, as to become the object of our belief: Partly because that nature, concerning the communicativeness whereof we now enquire, is manifestly above our comprehension, and we therefore not to disbelieve every thing concerning it, which we cannot comprehend, and partly because it is more certain that this is a doctrine of God, who can neither deceive nor be deceiv'd, than it can be supposed to be, that such a communication is impossible; there being for the former many positive and forcible proofs, for the latter only our own ignorance of the *modus*. For whatever men may talk of a contradiction in it, which to be sure is no direct and manifest one, no man ought to be over certain of a contradiction there, where the terms between which it is suppos'd to be are not very well known by him, which I suppose neither the nature nor personality of God are. If any man shall notwithstanding all this ask, as they, who are not disposed to believe, will not be easily satisfied, how it is possible to think, even with the forementioned explication, that the Father should be God, and the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God, and yet not three Gods but one God; I shall return him the same answer which a poor Grecian sometime did to one who put a like question to him. For when one rather to try his skill, than for any other reason, demanded of him how one and the same person, even Christ, could be God and Man, that is to say, finite and infinite; his answer was very short, but to my seeming very prudent, *ask him*. It was enough to him, as it may be to us, that Christ, to whom we immediately owe the revelation of such doctrines, hath delivered such a conception, that he, who is truth it self, hath assur'd us of it. If any man would know farther than so, either in this mystery or any other, let him apply himself to him that taught them as being the only person either fitted for, or obliged to give account of them.

L

Almighty,

# Almighty.

## The Contents.

*Almightiness* consider'd as denoting the great power of God, and why I embrace that notion, rather than that of his universal dominion. Enquiry thereupon made. 1. Of what force the doctrine of the Scripture may be supposed to be, which is shewn to be more proper to confirm and explain it, than to give the first establishment to it. 2. What is the importance of that *Almightiness* which is here asserted, which is also shewn to be all things that do not imply a contradiction either in themselves, or to the divine perfections. Certain rules laid down to judge of the one and other contradiction, that so we may neither derogate from the power of God, nor attribute thereto those things that are incompetent to it. 3. How it may appear that God and particularly God the Father is *Almighty*, which is also evidenced at large.

**Almighty**

**N**EXT to the name of *Father*, follows the title of *Almighty*, (for so our Creed proceeds, *I believe in God the Father Almighty*) a word, which is not more dreadful to the unbelieving and impenitent, than comfortable to those which believe and obey him. It is a most Sovereign Antidote against all our fears, it is a no less sure establishment of all our hopes. It gives strength to that faith by which we live, to that patience whereby we are enabled to suffer. If our enemies be mighty, that assures us that God is much more so, and can either deliver or support us; if our sins be prevalent, yet not proportionably to the power of his Grace, to the strength of an *Almighty* arm. If God propose any thing to our belief, how strange soever, that will make it credible; if he promise any thing, that will encourage us to hope for and expect it; Yea though it be a resurrection from the dead, and the recollection of those ashes which have been scattered in the air. Lastly, if, as it too often happens, the fear of man prompt us to a sin, that one word *Almighty* will restrain us from it, and make all that fear ineffectual: It being easy to collect, that it is much more reasonable to fear him, who *after he hath kill'd the body hath power also to cast into hell*. Such are the fruits and benefits which arise to mankind from the consideration of Gods *Almightiness*, and therefore no less worthy of our observance, than the Compilers of the Creed thought it of theirs, who though they have omitted all the other attributes of God, have yet inserted this of *Almighty* in it.

But here before I proceed to the explication of it, it is not to be dissolved, that the Word <sup>a</sup>, which we render *Almighty*, signifies primarily and properly the universality of Gods dominion, and is accordingly by the Septuagint <sup>b</sup> frequently set to denote the Lord of Hosts, and so interpreted by *Ruffinus* <sup>c</sup> in his exposition of the Creed. But because the word <sup>d</sup> is by the same Septuagint <sup>d</sup> also set for the Hebrew *Shaddai*, which signifies not so much Gods Dominion as his Strength and Power,

<sup>a</sup> πανταξ-  
τωρ.

<sup>b</sup> 2 Sam. 7. 8.  
26.

<sup>c</sup> 1 Kings 19. 10.

<sup>d</sup> Omnipotens  
autem ab eo di-  
citur, quod om-  
nium teneat po-  
tentatum.

<sup>e</sup> Job 5. 17.

— 15. 25.

— 35. 13.

Power, particularly in the book of *Job*, where there are the most express proofs of that; and because the former notion of it, even the universality of Gods dominion is both grounded upon, and virtually contained in the following words *maker of Heaven and Earth*. which though some of the ancient Creeds had not, particularly those which are referr'd to by *Ruffinus*, yet the present Creed hath; Lastly, because the same God the Father is afterwards stil'd *παντοδύναμος*. which literally signifies the universality of his Strength and Power: For these reasons, I say, I shall at present consider it in that notion, reserving whatsoever may be necessary to be spoken of Gods sovereignty and dominion over the world, till I have shewed him to be the Author of it, upon which his dominion is founded. And indeed whatever may have been the sense of the word *παντοκράτωρ*. when it stood alone in the Creed, and without the addition of *maker of heaven and earth*, which is now particularly express'd: Yet when it is not only confess'd to signify also Gods Almightyness, but that Father who is here stil'd *παντοκράτωρ* is stiled afterwards *παντοδύναμος*, which is also acknowledged to signify most properly the same Almightyness; it may seem little less than necessary to give it that sense as it now stands, and as it is now both attended and interpreted. For who can well give the word *παντοκράτωρ* any other sense than that of Almighty, when the very same Creed, when it comes afterwards to speak of the same *Father*, describes him by the word *παντοδύναμος*, which doth most properly denote it? Or suppose the universality of Gods dominion intended, when it is followed by his *making Heaven and Earth*, which is the only foundation of it? this being in reason rather to have preceeded than followed it, if that had been the present importance of it. However when both notions are confessedly in the Creed, nothing can hinder us from giving that of *Almighty* the precedency, especially when the other will most naturally be handled in the close of that Article which follows it.

Now there are three things which will be requisite to be enquir'd into, toward the establishment of the present Article.

1. Of what force the doctrine of the Scripture may be suppos'd to be in this affair.
2. What is the importance of that Almightyness which is here asserted.
3. How it may appear that God, and particularly God the Father, is so Almighty.

I. As he who would go about to establish the being of a God, must, if he would do it effectually, establish the infinity of his nature, and particularly of his power, which is an essential attribute thereof; so it is alike necessary for him to give the *first* establishment to that, by such arguments as reason offers, and not from the declarations of the Scripture: Because whatever Authority that may be supposed to be of, it must derive it from God, whose testimony it pretends to be, and whose being therefore and nature it supposeth. But as it is one thing to say, that the testimony of Scripture will not serve to give the first establishment to the nature of God, and another that it will not serve to confirm and explain it; so nothing hinders the calling it in, to confirm and explain that Almightyness, which is the subject of our present consideration. For being otherwise assur'd of the being and nature of that God, whose that Scripture is affirmed to be; being moreover assur'd that that Scripture is the



word of God, and to which therefore a firm and unshaken Faith ought to be given; though its testimony may not be allow'd to give the first establishment to Gods Almightyness, yet will it be of no small force to confirm us in the belief of it, and both perfect and clear up our natural apprehensions concerning it. For which cause, to such arguments, as reason offers, I shall not scruple to subjoin those of Scripture, as which in their place are of no less force, than the natural issues of our own mind.

II. It appearing from the premisses, of what force the doctrine of the Scripture may be suppos'd to be in this affair, proceed we to enquire what is the importance of that Almightyness which is asserted, though because that hath been sufficiently done by others, I shall the less insist upon it. It may suffice here to say, that as that Almightyness because the attribute of the most excellent nature, is of necessity to be restrain'd to such things as bear no contrariety to God's other perfections, and which are no less essential to him than his power, whence it is that the Scripture affirms <sup>f</sup> that it is impossible for God to lie: So it is in like manner to be restrain'd to such things as do not imply a contradiction in themselves, because the object of no power, and therefore without any derogation to God, to be denied to his Almighty one. But other limits than those it will be as absurd as impious to affix to it; both because of the term of Almightyness by which it is here describ'd, and because it appears from the nature of God, that he is infinite in all his excellencies, and therefore also in that power, which is here attributed to him. Two things only would be added to the restrictions before mentioned, because a necessary direction to us in the right application of them. 1. That before we call any thing even so impossible to God, we be very well assur'd of the contradiction it may be supposed to involve either to the Divine Nature, or to it self. As 2. That we be not so jealous of our own minds, as not to look upon that as impossible to God, which we have sufficient grounds to assure us of. For if we be guilty of the former, we may derogate from the power of God rather than rightly state it; as if of the latter, involve our selves in manifold errors, yea even as to the nature of that God, of the limitations of whose power we seem to be so jealous, as well as of our own apprehensions. Now if it should be demanded, as indeed otherwise those admonitions would not much avail, what general rules we are to propose to our selves in judging of that contradiction whereof we speak, I answer,

I. To consider well of the nature of the thing, about which the supposed impossibility is conversant; for if that be clear and obvious to our either senses or understanding, we may be so much the more bold in passing judgment, but if not, we ought to be more wary and deliberate. Thus for instance, if the question be concerning our Saviour's Body, which how divinely soever attended, we are assur'd to be a true and perfect one, we are not at all (because the nature of bodies is so far obvious both to our sense and understanding) to scruple the denying the possibility of its being in more places at once, or those doctrines which are consequent upon it: It being of the nature of a body to be circumscrib'd within such limits as are proportionable to its respective dimensions, and therefore either to continue within them, or cease to be so. Which is so true, that even they, who affirm our Saviour's body to be in more places than one, are forc'd to call in a miracle, yea many miracles to help it out. On the other side if the question be concerning the communicative-

<sup>e</sup> See Pearson on the Creed, Article of Christ's sitting at the right hand of God the Father Almighty.  
<sup>f</sup> Heb. 6. 18.

ness of the Divine Nature, and the possibility of its subsisting in three distinct persons, I should think it as daring a thing to determine it to be impossible, especially when that, which we have cause to believe to be Gods word, hath assur'd us of the existence of it: Because the divine nature, so far as it doth not manifest it self by its operations upon the world, is a perfect riddle to us, and would be less divine unless it were so.

2. It would be considered secondly, whether that about which the suppos'd impossibility is conversant, relate to natural religion or not. For if the former of these be the thing in question, we may the more boldly pass our judgments concerning it, because the reasonings of our own minds are no improper judges of it. Thus for instance, if question should be made concerning any principles which may be suppos'd to be inconsistent with that great one of *Gods being a rewarder of those that diligently seek him*, I should not at all doubt, because that is the foundation of all natural as well as reveal'd Religion, that the mind of man where it hath sufficient grounds for the belief of such an inconsistency, may not only pronounce of it as such, but as impossible also to that divine goodness on which it is built. I say not, neither can say the same, where the thing about which the suppos'd impossibility is conversant hath no relation at all to natural Religion or the foundations of it: Because there the mind of man may be yet more bound up, as having for its guide the revelations of God as well as the results of its own natural dictates. Upon which account if question be made concerning those ways and means which God is in Scripture said to take toward the saving of the world, I should think, whatever plausible reasons may offer themselves, men should not be over forward to affirm any thing to be inconsistent with Gods attributes, and so impossible to him, which may seem to be deliver'd there as his work and method: Because neither is it of the foundation of Religion to believe this or that particular way of saving of us, nor are the methods of Gods operations so easily to be investigated by the dictates of our minds, as they may be suppos'd to be by the Revelations of God. But by this rule we may prescribe against the exceptions of *Celsus* and other such scoffers, who objected against Christianity the indecency of *the Son of Gods entring into a womb*, the greater reason there was, if he meant to shew himself God, of his avoiding death than rising from it, the behooffulness there was of his rather vanishing from the cross, than staying to rise from a grave; or, if he would rise from thence, of his shewing himself to his crucifiers, rather than to his own disciples. For though Christianity be fairly defensible against all these plausible insinuations, yet it may suffice us to make answer, that what is worthy or not worthy of God in those particulars, is rather to be judg'd of by his own revelations, than by the dictates of mens minds; which, besides their being finite, may be suppos'd to be out of their own sphere, when they pretend to judge of the wayes and methods of God, which are no part of natural Religion, nor of necessity to be known in order to the embracing of it.

3. And though, if the perverseness of men had not made the contrary necessary, it might have sufficed to have ended our considerations here, yet I cannot forbear to add therefore, that it would also be considered, whether that which is suppos'd to be impossible hath not matter of fact to vouch for it. For then all our ratiocinations about the impossibility of the thing will be vain and ineffectual, because we can have no more convincing

<sup>a</sup> Heb. 11. 6.

<sup>b</sup> Vid. Origen. <sup>c</sup> contra Celsum.

convincing proof of the possibility of a thing, than its actual existence. This being a thing, which is either immediately made out to us by the testimony of our senses, or by such apprehensions of the mind as do immediately result from thence. Upon which account it is, that we prescribe, and not without reason, against all such arguments as are alledg'd from the nature or providence of God, to shew that the *Church cannot err*, or that *it could not alter that Faith which at first it receiv'd*, in which kind of arguments the *Church of Rome* is now much delighted: It being a vain thing to alledge an impossibility of her erring, or making alterations in Faith, when both that Faith and her deviations from it are evident to our senses, or at least to such apprehensions of the mind as are immediately founded on them. But so therefore one would have thought some of our own might have avoided the like argument, when they employ'd the same Divine Providence, and the care of the both Jewish and Christian Church against the various readings of the Scriptures. For beside that both the one and the other have sufficiently manifested themselves by preserving the Scriptures from any material alterations; who can be taken off by the most specious arguments from the acknowledgment of that, which his own eyes, if he will make use of them, will be forced to attest?

III. Now as after I have thus shewn what the Almightyness here asserted is, it can be but reasonable to shew that God, and particularly God the Father is thus Almighty; so to make it so much the more easily to be receiv'd, I will proceed to the proof of it by degrees,

I. Offering first unto consideration, that many things are undoubtedly possible to God, which yet may be impossible, in the apprehension, or to the power of man. For though that be but a step yea a short one to the proof of an Almighty power, yet will it contribute not a little thereto, because removing one of the greatest obstacles to our belief of it, even the measuring of that power of his by our own understanding or arm: It being no less certain from the reasonings of our own minds, than from the examples to be afterwards alledged out of the Scriptures, that the chief cause of mens doubting of the possibility of any thing to God, is because they cannot apprehend the manner of it, or because it is not to be effected by any humane power. Now that many things are undoubtedly possible to God, which yet may be impossible in the apprehensions of man, which is the former of the things before affirmed, will appear if we reflect, I do not say upon the finiteness, but upon the shortness of his apprehension, even in those things which lie plain and open before him. For is it not alike true of natural things, what *St. Paul* spake of things of a higher nature, that *he knows but in part and prophesies in part*? Is it not true as to those works of God, of whose being and operations he is most assur'd, and which are as evident to his senses as that light by which he doth behold them? From whence else that perplexity of humane understandings in giving an account of the *ebbing and flowing* of the Sea, in apprehending or being able to make out to others the causes of all those operations for which the *Loadstone* is so remarkable? From whence else the like perplexity as to the *growth of our own bodies*, either in the womb, or afterwards, as to the *nature or procedure* of our own *understandings*? For however these and a thousand such like things may seem to lie open to us, and indeed so far do, as to convince us of their being and effects; yet we understand not the particular causes



causes of them, nor the manner of their procedure. He, who hath attain'd to the highest measure of knowledge, can go no farther than a bare conjecture, and such as is attended with insuperable difficulties. And is it not then to be believ'd, that we shall be much more at a loss in those things which do not as yet exist, and which, because only possible, shall peradventure never be? As to the power of him, from whom all those things receive both their power and efficacy, and as to the things which he is in a capacity to produce? For beside that so great an Agent must be supposed to be of a more mysterious nature, than those things which are produced by him, there is a vast disproportion between the meer possibilities of things, and the nature or causes of those things which do actually exist: These as they are apparent either to our senses or understandings, so having as apparent operations to assist us in judging of them, which the other must be concluded to be without. Now forasmuch as we cannot judge, with any certainty, even of those things that do exist, and whose operations too as well as being are apparent to our either sense or understanding; forasmuch as we can therefore less judge of the possibilities of things, and of the extent of his power by whom all things that exist were produced: Either there are few things possible to God, which the many wonderful works of his, which we behold, forbid us to believe; or there must be many things possible to him, of the possibility whereof we have no apprehension, and which therefore, if we make those apprehensions our measure, must appear impossible to us. I will not say much to shew, though that be a great part of my present assertion, that many things are possible to God, which are impossible to the power of man: partly because the power of the Creator of the World may easily be supposed to surpass the power of one of his creatures; and partly, because we shall need only to refer those, who think otherwise, to the works of God, but especially to those in which he doth so triumph, and with which he endeavours to abate the confidence of men. <sup>Job 38. 31.</sup>  
For canst thou, whosever thou art, bind the sweet influences of Pleiades, or loose the bands of Orion? Canst thou bring forth Mazzaroth in his season, or guide Arcturus with his sons? Canst thou lift up thy voice to the clouds, that abundance of waters may cover thee? Canst thou send lightnings that they may go, and say unto thee here we are? Or hast thou (as the same God speaks <sup>Job 40. 9.</sup> elsewhere) an arm like God, or canst thou, how potent soever thou art, thunder with a voice like him? Deck now thy self with majesty and excellency, and array thy self with glory and beauty. Cast abroad the rage of thy wrath, and behold every one that is proud and abase him. Look on every one that is proud and bring him low, and tread down the wicked in their place. For all this, and a thousand things more, God both can do and doth, which weak man will find it hard but to understand. And indeed so reasonable is this challenge of God, and so very pertinent to the thing which it now concerns me to establish, that as (if we may believe <sup>Justin Martyr,</sup> by whom those verses are cited as his) <sup>Pythagoras</sup> made the like challenge in his behalf, so I cannot forbear, for the affinity it hath with the former, to set it down in that Author's own words.

Ἐἰ τις ἔσθ'. δαίς εἰμι, πέραξ ἄνθρωπος, οὗτος ἐρείλει  
 Κόσμον ἱσθ' τοῦτο γήσας εἰπέν. ἡμεῖς οὗτος,  
 Κούχ' μόνον γήσας εἰπέν ἡμεῖς. ἀλλὰ κατοικεῖν  
 Αὐτὸς ἐν ᾧ πεποίηκε κατοικεῖται δ' ἀπὸ τέτοιο.

If any one, saith he, pretend to be God, beside the true, and so may we to any man who pretends to the same power, let him make a world like to this, and inhabit in it when he hath done. Let him, as God sometime did by the old lay the foundation of a new earth, let him stretch out his line upon it. Let him cover it with a new Sea, as with a Garment, let him cause that Sea to gather into one place. Let him set Bars and doors to it, saying, hitherto shalt thou go and no farther, and here shall thy proud waves be staid. For all these things, as the same *Pythagoras* insinuates, have been done by God, and ought therefore, unless they could be imitated by us, to be look'd upon as a proof of the excellency of his power above that of ours, and therefore also of many things being possible to God, which are impossible to the power, as well as in the apprehensions of man. But so hath the Scripture also given us reason to believe, as may appear both from its general assertions and particular instances: for not

▪ Luke 18. 27. contented to say, yea to deliver it as the voice of our Saviour<sup>m</sup>, that *that which is impossible with men is possible with God*, it moreover acquaints us, that what both *Sarah* and the *Virgin Mary* conceiv'd to be impossible, and was indeed such considering the ordinary course of nature, and their own present circumstances, God did afterwards fulfil to them, by

▪ Mat. 1. 18. making the one to conceive<sup>n</sup> without the knowledge of a man, as the

▪ Heb. 11. 11, 12. other to do the like though she her self was old<sup>o</sup>, and by one too who was as old and as unlikely as her self.

2. But not to stay any longer upon this first step to the proof of Gods Almightyness, as because it is but the first, so there are others which will bring us nearer to it; consider we in the second place, that no created power is able to controul God, but he on the contrary them. For though that neither will not bring us to the thing we aim at, yet it will bring us so near to it, as to shew that nothing can be made impossible to God by the opposition of a contrary power. As indeed how should there, when whatsoever power is in any or all of the Creatures is both deriv'd to them from God, and depends upon the influence of his Providence? for what resistance can they be supposed to make, who have nothing to arm them against him but a borrowed and precarious power? Or how he not able to controul them, who can mortifie them without any other opposition than the withdrawing of his own influences? Agreeable hereto is the Doctrine of the Scriptures, yea the doctrine of those men, who before were otherwise perswaded, but found themselves oblig'd by the hand of God upon them to acknowledge it. For *this* (saith God by the Prophet *Isaiah* concerning his intended severity toward the Assyrians) *is the purpose that is purposed upon the whole earth, and this is the hand that is stretched out upon all Nations. For the Lord of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it? And his hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back?* And though History doth not afford us an instance of one, who was more puissant than *Nebuchadnezzar*, or who seemed more to defie the threats and power of God; yet that sad calamity, which afterwards befel him in being driven from men, and made to eat grass, as well as to converse with the Beasts of the Field, oblig'd him to acknowledge, that<sup>q</sup> *all the inhabitants of the world are reputed as nothing in comparison of God, and that as he doth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth, so none can stay his hand, or say unto him what dost thou?*

3. It would be considered thirdly, as which will bring us still nearer to

to Gods Almightyness, though that be rather a probable than demonstrative proof thereof, that all Religions or at least the soberest men of all have attributed as much to God, as our Creed instructs us to ascribe to him. For to say nothing at all of our selves, as whose Scriptures, as well as Creed, do attest to it, and we find it expressly affirm'd, that *all things* <sup>Mat. 19. 26.</sup> *are possible with God*, and again *that nothing is impossible with him*; <sup>Luc. 1. 37.</sup> As neither concerning the Jews, because their opinion is equally known, and because their Scriptures in like manner affirm, that *God can do every thing*, <sup>Job 42. 2.</sup> and that *there is nothing too hard for him*: There are the like <sup>Gen. 18. 14.</sup> evidences of Gods Almightyness in the writings of the Heathen, and which, because Heathen, are in some respect so much the more to be valued; I do not mean, upon the account of that natural light by which it may seem to have been instilled into them, but because they divided the Deity among so many pretenders, that it is not a little to be wonder'd they should preserve the notion of Omnipotence; as which in truth is competible but to one. Which notwithstanding, even these have attested to it, and that too no less clearly, than either our own or the Jewish Scriptures. For *all things* (saith *Linus*) are not only possible but *easy to God*, neither is there any thing which cannot be effected by him. The Gods (saith *Homer* more than once) *can do all things*; and, if you know God (saith *Callimachus*) you must needs know this, that every thing is possible to him to do. For what are these but the remainders of those natural truths which God hath imprinted upon our Souls, and which no opinions, how contrary soever to them, have been able utterly to deface?

Linus.

Ἡ δὲ πᾶσι θεῶν ἐκείνων καὶ ἀνθρώπων ὁ δὲ θεός.

Homer.

Ἡ δὲ δὲ τὸ πᾶν δύναται.

Callimachus.

ὁ δὲ θεὸς ὁ δὲ θεός.

Ἡ δὲ δὲ τὸ πᾶν δύναται.

Vid. plura apud Grot. in Mat. 19. 26.

4. But then if we moreover consider, that he, whom we and the generality of men profess to believe *Almighty*, hath been before demonstrated to be infinite in his perfections, and therefore also in his power, which is a part of them; So we shall not want either a full or cogent proof of his Almightyness, of his being able to do all things, which are possible to be done, or sutable to those other excellencies wherewith he is alike adorn'd: That power being not to be look'd upon as infinite, to which any thing is impossible but what is the object of no power, or of such a one, which is more reproachful to it, than any impotency whatsoever. So great reason is there to believe *Almighty* to be an attribute of that nature, which is in truth as well as in name divine: How much more then of him, who is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Fountain of the Deity as well as of the whole Creation?

M

Maker



# Maker of Heaven and Earth.

## The Contents.

*After an account of the meaning of Heaven and Earth (which is shewn to denote the Universe) and the interest divine and human testimonies may be suppos'd to have in establishing the making of it, there is shewn, I. That the Universe was made, as that too, both as to that frame wherein we now behold it, and as to that matter whereof it was compos'd. Evidences of both, from reason and testimony, as well human as divine. A more particular account of the force of divine testimonies in this affair, and the strength they may be suppos'd to give whether to the Creation it self or the circumstances thereof. It is shewn, II. That the Universe was made by God, and particularly by God the Father. After which enquiry is made, III. Into that Dominion which accrueeth unto God from it, and both that Dominion and the Universality thereof established and explain'd.*

### Maker of Heaven & Earth.

<sup>a</sup> Iren. adv. her.  
li. I. c. 2. <sup>b</sup> Euseb.  
ἐν τῇ δὲ πα-  
τέρῃ πάντο-  
κράτορα τὴν  
σοφίαν ἔχοντα  
τὸν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ  
τῶν πάντων  
δαιμονίων καὶ  
πάντα τὰ ἐν  
αὐτοῖς. Tertull.  
de veland.  
Virg. c. I. In  
unicum deum  
omnipotentem, mundi conditorem. Idem de Prescript. her. Regula est autem fidei, ut jam hinc quid defendamus profiteamur, illa scilicet quæ creditur unum omnino deum esse, nec alium præter mundi conditorem, qui universa de nibilo produxerit, &c.  
c. 13. <sup>c</sup> Πιστεύομεν ἐν ἑνὶ θεῷ πατὶρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀόρατων ποιητήν. Socrat. Eccl.  
Hist. li. I. c. 8.

**I**T appearing from the Explications of those, in whom we find the first mention of the Creed, that *Heaven and Earth*, whereof God is here affirmed to be the *maker*, denoted all those beings which they contain, as well as those vast bodies themselves; and the same being in like manner evident from the <sup>b</sup> *Nicene*, which was intended for an Explication of this, because in the room of *Maker of Heaven and Earth*, substituting the *maker of all things visible and invisible*, which, because terms of immediate contradiction, comprehend all beings whatsoever; I shall suppose my self excus'd from any farther proofs of those words being as *comprehensive*, as those *bodies* they were primarily intended to denote. For which cause I will forthwith address my self to shew this *Universe to have been made*, as that it had for its maker him, to whom it is here ascrib'd, and what *Dominion* accrues to him thereby.

I. Now to make it appear that *this Universe was made*, which is the first, and indeed the chief of the former Assertions, as from which both the other may be easily infer'd, I will make it my business to shew first, that *that frame* wherein we now behold it was so, as secondly, that *that matter* was so also whereof it was compacted. For as more than these cannot be necessary to shew, because giving a full account of its being made; so it cannot but be thought equally necessary to establish them both, if we would satisfy either our Religion or our Reason: Not only the former of these prompting us to believe the world to have been made of nothing, but

but that account which our reason offers us concerning the being and nature of God, and which accordingly we have established from thence. For if he be the only eternal being, all other things must have been made, and therefore also, because otherwise there would be something else Eternal, that matter whereof the world was fram'd.

I. It is easie to observe, and hath accordingly been taken notice of by others, that the *worlds being made* is a matter of fact, and may therefore, because such seem most naturally to be prov'd by testimony. It is not my purpose to invalidate that inference, as which seems to me not to be without its force, and which accordingly I intend to make advantage of: But I must say withal, that the *worlds being made* is such a matter of fact, that no full and convincing proof can be made of it by testimony. As will appear, if we consider either the testimony of men, or God, into one or both of which our faith must be in fine resolv'd. For the Book of *Genesis*, which is the most full account of the Creation of the World, placing the making of man at the end of the Creation, and of which therefore he cannot be suppos'd to have been a competent witness, any more than we can suppose him to have been of his own; we must of necessity resolve his belief of the Creation of the World into the natural issues of his own reason, or into the revelation of him by whom it is suppos'd to have been made: Which revelation, however it might be satisfactory to the first man, yet cannot be suppos'd to be to us, till we are first assur'd of the being and nature of him from whom that revelation proceeded. And though the like be not to be said against the testimony of God, because a sufficient witness of what he himself fram'd; yet, as we cannot be induced to accept of his testimony, till we are first in some measure assur'd of his being and nature, so I believe it will be a hard matter to come to the knowledge of God, but by the consideration of his works, and of those proofs which they will afford us of their having been made by him. Which will consequently render the testimony of God; rather a secondary than primary proof, and such as will therefore serve rather to confirm and strengthen that belief which reason leads us to, than beget one in the minds of men. And in this sense I conceive it is, that we are to understand the Author to the Hebrews when he affirms, that *by faith we understand the worlds to have been made*, if we consider the making of it in it self, and not as to the manner after which it was so. For though the word of God, upon which our faith is superstructed, be both a primary and cogent proof of the latter, yet I conceive it is not to be look'd upon as such in regard of the former: Because his testimony cannot be of force with us, till we be in some measure assur'd of his being and nature; as neither can we of that, but by such proofs as reason offers from the consideration of his works, and of those which they will afford us of their having been made by him. For which cause, though I intend to call in to my assistance those proofs which we have from testimony, and especially from the testimony of God in Scripture, yet I will give the precedence to those of reason, and establish the making of the world by them.

Heb. 11. 3

Now there are two proofs which reason offers for the worlds having been made, if we consider it as to that frame wherein it now appears; to wit, that manner of production of things which we now behold and other than which our Fathers never did, and the continuance of many of those Rocks wherewith the Sea abounds, and by which it becomes so prejudi-

cial to those that fail in it. For to begin with the first of these, even that manner of production of things which we now behold, and which, if well consider'd, will prove the world to have been made, if we look upon it as to that frame wherein it now appears. For do we not see, that I may instance only in those, plants to arise from seed, fish from spawn, and fowls from eggs, as that seed, and spawn, and eggs, to have had for their original other plants, and fish, and fowl, from which they did proceed; Now I demand of any man whether this manner of production always was, or whether it had sometime a beginning? If he saith the latter of these, we have then what we desire, even a convincing proof of the world's not having been always in the same frame and posture wherein we now behold it, and consequently that it was so far forth made. And for any man to say the former would involve him in a palpable contradiction, and from which of all others the mind of man doth most abhor. For if that production of things, which we now behold, hath always been, it will follow that the race of plants, and fish, and fowl, have been always before that seed which they emit, as that again always before the other: By which means, both the one and the other must always have been both before and after each other; than which what contradiction is more gross and palpable, or than which therefore we can desire a more forcible proof, to discredit the eternity of the world, and which cannot be suppos'd to stand without it. But neither is there less evidence of the world's having been made, if we consider it as to that part of it, which is notorious to those that go down to the Sea in Ships, and who are often no less prejudiced by it in their life and commerce, than their Souls and Consciences are by their extravagancies. For if, as *Vossius*<sup>d</sup> well argues, this world have been from Eternity (for so it must have been if it were not made) how comes it to pass that several Rocks of the Sea, whose roots are strangely eaten, do yet continue both to be, and to be terrible? For though it should be granted that the Sea doth not wear off one ounce of them in a thousand Platonick years, each of which is 30000. common ones, yet even so it will not follow but the Sea must long since have worn them quite away; because a thousand Platonick years, though never so often repeated, will never amount to an Eternity. Neither will it avail to say, as the same *Vossius*<sup>e</sup> hath observ'd, that they acquire as much by some internal power of growing as they lose by the violence of the Sea. For beside that internal power of growing is an assertion that hath nothing to warrant it, no man having ever seen any new Rocks, or heard of any that have sprung up for many Ages past; that productive power, whatsoever it is, cannot be supposed to be equal to that by which the Sea preys upon them, the violence of that having not only worn away the roots of some Rocks, but left others so slender ones as to threaten their downfall. And more than this I shall not offer from reason as to the worlds having been made, if we consider it as to its present frame: Because those, who may seem to have fallen out most with the *Maker* of it, even the *Epicureans*, have yet found themselves obliged to acknowledge it, though, as I shall afterwards shew, to the ruine of their own dear *hypothesis*.

It appearing from the premises, that the world did not always exist as it is, and therefore also that it was made, pass we now to shew, that that matter, whereof it was fram'd, was so, which will put the making of it out of doubt. And here not to repeat what hath been elsewhere<sup>f</sup> alledg'd to shew, that there can be but one eternal being, and consequently,

<sup>d</sup> Dissert. de Verâ ætate mundi, cap. 1.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid.

<sup>f</sup> Explic. of that Article, 1 believ'd in Gen.



ly, that whatsoever is in the world beside, must owe its being as well as frame to that; I shall desire it may be considered, whether that matter contain'd in it the present perfections of the world, though strangely blended and confounded together, or whether it ought to be conceiv'd as devoid of all, in which sense we find it sometime taken. But beside that the latter of these first matters is suppos'd by those, who do assert it, to have no existence, and therefore not to give us any trouble who are enquiring after that which had; That other first matter will appear as much to have been made, as that world which was framed of it: Partly because otherwise no right could accrue to God to frame and fashion it at his pleasure, and much less to exercise an absolute dominion over it (for what right could God be suppos'd to have over that, which was not only none of his own workmanship, but as eternal as himself?) and partly because nothing can be supposed to be eternal which is of so confused a nature. For as no reason can be given, why that which is eternal *à parte ante* should not be so also *à parte post*, and consequently infinite in its duration; so neither (as was before observ'd) why it should not be as infinite in all other its qualifications and endowments: Which how it agrees with so confused a thing as that first matter, I shall leave all sober men to judge. And indeed as it is not easy to conceive, men would ever have attributed eternity to that, were it not for an opinion they had that no being could be made of nothing, which yet implies no contradiction in it (for whatsoever there may be of difficulty in it, it implies no contradiction at all for that to be which before was not, and therefore neither any impossibility to an infinite power) so all the ground they had to build that opinion on was their observing all whether natural or artificial agents to work upon a preexistent matter. But beside that there is in all mens opinion so great a distance between God and all other beings, that that alone should have hindred them from prescribing limits unto him from the operations of natural or artificial agents; The same argument would have been of as much force against their own account of the original of the world, as against the making of all things out of nothing. For if we are not to believe any thing to have been made of nothing, because all things now work upon a preexistent matter, neither are we to believe any thing to have been made by I know not what fortuitous concurrence of Atomes in an infinite space: Because it is alike certain, that whatever beings are now produc'd proceed from regular and certain causes, and such as hold some Analogy to those beings which they produce.

To such proofs as reason offers subjoin we those from testimony, as which will not only now have a proper place here, but confer not a little to the strengthening of the other: Partly, because assuring us that those reasonings of ours are not ill founded, as for which we have the concurrence of other mens; and partly, because of their own propriety to the matter in hand, as which, generally speaking, they are the most natural proofs of. For the evidencing whereof, we will first produce such testimonies as are more properly humane, and then such as are also Divine. For though, to begin with the first of these, it be not at all to be doubted, that there hath been great variety in the world about the account of the Original thereof; though several Nations of the World have departed alike from *Moses* and themselves in computing the age of it: yet in this they have all agreed, that they have assign'd it an original, and

and accordingly, after their several humours reckoned more or less time of its continuance. Of which consent, especially when there is such a dissent as to particulars, what account can be given, but that they found themselves oblig'd by tradition as well as their own reason to look upon the world as made, though, after what manner, or in what distance from themselves, they were not in like manner assur'd? Now as of a tradition that is so general no other account can well be given than that it descended from those who were the common parents of mankind, especially when we find the like to have prevail'd among the *Chineses*, who till of late, were unknown to us, and to whom also we and the other parts of the world were; so cannot those common Parents of mankind be thought to have deriv'd it from any other than him, by whom both themselves and the world were fram'd, or from the notice of their own beginning; Which though it be no demonstrative proof of the worlds having a beginning much about the same time; yet is at least a probable one; both because they could not discern any being better than themselves, and which therefore they had any reason to think not to have been made as well as they; and because that reason, wherewith they were endow'd, and by which they were fitted to exercise dominion over the world, made it probable that their happiness was design'd in the creating of it. But because I have said that we have not only humane testimonies but divine, and such too, as because divine, must be much more conclusive, therefore proceed we to consider both of their importance and force, and so give yet more strength to the reasonings of our own minds. Where first I shall take notice of those which touch it on the by, and then, because they also will shew the world to have been made of nothing, those which do primarily and purposely respect

<sup>1</sup> Psal. 89. 11.

<sup>1</sup> Psal. 136. 5.

Ps.

it. Of the former sort is that of the Psalmist<sup>1</sup>, *The heavens are thine and the earth also is thine, as for the world and the fulness thereof thou hast founded them*; as that other of the same Psalmist<sup>1</sup>, *O give thanks unto him that by wisdom made the heavens, for his mercy endureth for ever. To him that stretched out the earth above the water, for his mercy endureth for ever. To him that made great lights, for his mercy endureth for ever. The Sun to rule by day, for his mercy endureth for ever. The Moon and stars to rule by night, for his mercy endureth for ever.* But so also do other holy men beside this Psalmist discourse, as is evident both from *Job* and *Nehemiah*, in the former where-

<sup>1</sup> Job 12. 7. &c.

<sup>1</sup> Neh. 9. 6.

of<sup>1</sup> we read, *Ask now the beasts and they shall teach thee, the fowls of the air and they shall tell thee, Or speak to the earth and it shall teach thee, and the fishes of the sea shall declare unto thee. Who knoweth not in all these, that the hand of the Lord hath wrought this?* In the latter<sup>1</sup>, *Thou, even thou, art Lord alone, thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens with all their hosts, the earth and all things that are therein, the sea and all that is therein.* Which, with other places that might be produc'd, do not only attest to the worlds being made, and every particular in it, but that they were made by him to whom they are here ascrib'd, and in whom we profess to believe. Only because these do but touch it on the by, and beside that do undoubtedly allude, unless perhaps that of *Job* do not, to the book of *Genesis* which treats *de industria* of that argument; I think it but just to admonish from thence; that in the beginning God made the heaven and the earth, though this latter to be sure (for so it is afterwards added) in a rude and

indigested

indigested lump; That immediately after that he created light and darkness; That he made a Firmament between the waters and the waters; That he caused the waters under the Heaven to gather into a Sea; That he made the dry land to bring forth Herbs and Trees; That he gave being to the greater and lesser Lights of Heaven, and set them in that Firmament which he had made; That he made the Waters to bring forth abundantly both Fowls and Fish; That he commanded the Earth to bring forth Cattel and creeping things and Beasts; Lastly, that he made Man of the dust of the Earth, and form'd an excellent spirit within him. And though it be true, that there is no particular mention of the creation of Angels, of whose being we have yet a sufficient evidence from the Scripture, yet as there is elsewhere <sup>m</sup> sufficient proof even of that, however not here particularly remembred, so the same book of *Genesis* assures us <sup>Phal. 148. 1: &c.</sup> expressly, that God together with the Heavens created all the Host of them, of which number we know from the same book <sup>Gen. 2. 1. & Gen. 32. 2:</sup> that the Angels are especially to be accounted. The only thing therefore remaining to be shewn from the Scripture, is, that God made all those things whether *mediately* or *immediately* of *nothing*, which the same book of *Genesis*, if well attended to, will not suffer us to doubt of. For doth not *Moses* affirm in the very first verse of the first Chapter of *Genesis*, that God made even that earth which was without form and void, as well as afterward gave it form, and both separated some beings from it, and caused it to produce others? And is not the matter of the world therefore so far to be look'd upon as his make, and if it be, ought it not to be look'd upon also as made of nothing? For how proper soever it may be to give the term of *make* to that which is digested into a new and regular being; yet is it not such to make a rude substance of a rude substance, a thing which is without form and void of that which was as much before: this being certainly rather to alter than to make, and, beside that, not to be affirm'd, especially of an infinitely wise being, unless it could be made appear, which cannot, that he put it into a nearer disposition to what it was afterwards to be, than it was before he medled with it. The same is to be said of that Heaven which God is said to have created with the former rude earth, whether thereby be meant an imperfect rude substance, or the heaven of heavens in its entire form. For being there is no preexistent matter assign'd, it is in reason to be suppos'd, if made, not to have been made of any such, and consequently made of nothing: unless such a production could be prov'd to be impossible, which I have already shewn it not to be. And though man, considered as to his body, appear from the same story to have been made of earth, and so far therefore not to be affirm'd to have been made of nothing, any farther than it can appear that that earth out of which he was taken was so; yet is there a more immediate proof of such a creation of his *soul* because said to have been *breath'd into* him by the Almighty: This, as it more immediately refers the making of his Soul to God, so leaving no place for suspicion of its being made of any preexistent matter, unless we will believe, which is not to be thought of so glorious a being, God to have breath as the Sons of Men have, or, which is equally inconsistent with the simplicity and indivisibleness of his Nature, that the Soul of Man was a portion of himself. Having thus produced such testimonies, as the Scripture offers us for the making of the world, having moreover from the same Scripture evinc'd its being made whether *mediately* or *immediately*



immediately out of nothing, we are now by the order of our discourse to shew more particularly of what force those testimonies are, as to that which they are brought to confirm. In order whereunto, we will consider them as to the making it self, and then as to the circumstances thereof. Now though no doubt be to be made if we consider the making it self, that the testimonies before alledg'd are no primary proofs of it, nor therefore proper to give the first establishment to it, yet is it as little to be doubted but they are of great force to confirm it; and ~~is~~ in the belief of it. For though the revelation of God be of no force, till it appear to us that there is a God, as whose being it doth suppose, and by whose authority it becomes valuable; yet that being once established, his revelations will extort our assent to them, and to all which they shall be found to affirm. By which means, what was before in some measure certain to us from our own reason, becomes yet more certain by the revelations of God; and we confirm'd by them in our former knowledge and belief. But then if we consider the making of the world, not as to it self, but as to its circumstances, under which notion we are in the next place to look upon it; so no doubt at all can be made, but that those testimonies of God are proper and primary proofs of it: Partly, because matters of fact are most naturally prov'd by testimony, and partly, because there is nothing prerequir'd from reason to oblige us to the owning of these. For though it may be necessary in some measure to understand from thence that the world was made; yet is it not in like manner prerequir'd that we should have any knowledge from it of the manner, or other the circumstances thereof: Because the Creation of the World will, without that, lead us to the knowledge and belief of him, whose testimony is now under consideration. But from hence it will appear first, that we shall need no other testimony than that of Scripture, that the World was made at that distance of time from us which we commonly reckon, and not either at that extravagant distance which some Nations have asserted, and much less from everlasting, as some persons have been willing to believe. It will appear secondly, because the affirmation of the same Scripture, and only one of the circumstances of the Creation, that God made the World, by his bare word, and the resolves

of his own will: Which, as *Longinus* well observes, is a great commendation of Gods power, yea, so far as we are able to judge, a confirmation of that Almighty one which we have before attributed to him; there being nothing which we can well suppose to be impossible to him, who, in order to the making of things to be, shall only bid them be so. It will appear lastly, and which I do therefore so rehearse, because it tends not a little to confirm those many miraculous effects which our Creed afterwards obligeth us to believe, it will appear I say from the premises, that God is under no necessity of making use of natural means to bring about those effects which he projects; it being evident from the Scripture, that God caused the earth to bring forth Herbs and Trees when as yet there was no Sun, who is now the standing Parent of all productions.

II. Now as after I have made it appear that the World was made, yea, made of nothing, I should now, according to my proposed method proceed to shew *him* to be the Author of it, to whom it is here *ascrib'd*; so I should willingly enough descend to the probation of it, if I had not before prevented my self in it, when I had for my argument the *being* of a God

God. But because I have there shewn, that there is an eternal, yea one only eternal being, and to whom therefore whatsoever is made must be supposed to owe theirs; having moreover shewn *that* one only eternal being to be no other than him to whom we give the appellation of God; it shall suffice me to remark that there is no pretence for the interposition of Chance, to which the great *Epicurus* and his interpreter *Lucretius*, have been willing to ascribe it: Chance as it is not by themselves affirm'd to be able to produce any thing out of nothing, so having as little reason to pretend either to the production or conservation of those many glorious beings which we behold. For though Chance should be suppos'd to produce some rare effects, and such as we might perhaps be not a little pleas'd with the contemplation of; yet can it not be suppos'd to produce a multitude and an orderly series of them, as it must be thought to do if it were the original of the world. Otherwise it would not be Chance but Wisdom, not that which acts at adventure, but with consideration. For what could wisdom do more, though it should rally together all its forces, and endeavour to shew forth both the subtlety and steadiness of its proceedings? As little necessity will there be, to stand long to shew him, whom we stile God the *father*, to be in a more peculiar manner *maker of heaven and earth*. For as the Scripture, from which alone we can know that there is such a person, hath assur'd us that *of him are all things*, as of the primo-prime cause, whereas they are only by the Son as by a *subordinate*, or subordinate one; So that Paternity of his in respect of the Son, persuades him to be yet more the Father of all things that owe their being to the Deity; He being not to be thought not to have a peculiar energy in the Creation of the world, from whom and by whom it is that Son comes to have any influence upon it. Setting aside therefore any farther consideration of the Maker of the world, we will proceed to enquire what *Dominion* accrues to him by it, as which is thought to have been intended anciently in that Almightyness which is before attributed to him, but is to be sure, if any where, to find a proper foundation here.

1 Cor. 8. 6.

III. I have been considering in my self with the best understanding that I have, what *medium* there is to evince God to have a Dominion over those things to which he himself hath given a being. I cannot after all my consideration brag of any great discovery I have made, because all I can find is, that that may seem with good right to be ones own, of which he is the entire Author, and consequently, that it is in the power of the party, whose it is, to dispose of it at pleasure, which is the very formality of dominion. But as men are oftentimes impos'd upon by bare words, and so prompted to embrace them for substantial things; so he that shall consider the importance of the foregoing *medium*, will find it to be no other, though in other words, than what it is design'd to prove. For to be ones own being nothing else than to have a right to dispose of a thing at pleasure, it will be all one to say, because that is the very formality of Dominion, that he may seem to have the dominion of any thing of which he himself is the Author, as to say, that that may seem to be his own of which he is so. But what then shall we alledge to evince this Dominion of Gods, or rather, what course shall we take to shew that it no more needs than is capable of any? Certainly no other, than, which is the last result of all ratiocinations, by bidding men to look into their own understandings, and

N

see

see whether they can avoid the thinking him not to have a right to dispose of things at pleasure who is confessed to be the maker of them. For that done, they will find there will need no other proof to satisfy them of the reasonableness thereof. Though if men should, as sometimes they will, be obstinate against the reasonings of their own minds, we shall need only to prompt them to apply themselves to the consideration of their own proper concerns, in which they cannot so easily abuse themselves. For do not those men who question the dominion of God, arrogate to themselves the same over those who are in some measure the product of their own beings? Do they not think they have a dominion over those who issue from their loynes, do they not both exercise that dominion over them, and think themselves ill dealt with, if it be either in word or fact denied? But so if they do, and must, God must be concluded to have a greater right to it, as who is certainly more our maker and theirs, than we can be supposed to be. And more than that I shall not need to say concerning Gods having a dominion; for which cause I will go on to enquire into the extent of it, whether in respect of those subjects over which it reacheth, or as to those Acts by which it may be exercised.

<sup>a</sup> Ruffin. Expos. in Symb. Apost. Omnipotens autem ab eo dicitur, quod omnium teneat potentatum.

<sup>1</sup> Acts 17. 24.

<sup>1</sup> I Tim. 6. 15.

<sup>1</sup> Ibid.

<sup>a</sup> Explic. of the Fifth Com.

It was affirmed by the Creed, as the word παντοκράτωρ, or Almighty was anciently understood in it, that God hath a dominion over all things whatsoever. And truly not without reason, if we consider him as the Creator of all things, as both reason and Scripture assures us that he was. For this dominion of his being founded in the Creation, it is in reason to extend to all those beings that are the object of it, and, because all beings are so, to all without exception. The result whereof will be, because all things receive their being from him, that animate as well as inanimate beings are the subject of his dominion, rational beings as well as irrational; as of rational again high as well as low, the most puissant Princes, as well as the meanest Peasants. Whence it is, that the Scripture doth not only entitle him *Lord of Heaven and Earth*<sup>1</sup>, and, as appears from the foregoing words, so as to denote him Lord also of *all things that are therein*; but *Lord of Lords*<sup>1</sup>, or, if that be not thought sufficiently expressive (because *King* seems to denote something higher) Lord or *King* even of *Kings* themselves. And indeed, as for *that* Scripture as well as for the foremention'd reason, such an universal dominion must be thought to be but due to him (for who may think themselves exempted, if Kings themselves are not?) so if it be well adverted to, it will be found to be of equal force, to shew that God doth always *retain* it. For if God be King of Kings, the dominion is still in him, neither can he so properly be said to have parted with any thing of his dominion to them, as to have entrusted them with the exercise thereof; As that too, with a power of revoking it when he pleaseth, or calling them to an account for it if they misemploy it: This being but due to the Sovereign power where e're it is, and therefore much more to him who is *King of Kings* and *Lord of Lords*. All which things I have said, not to derogate from the Authority of Princes, which I have elsewhere<sup>a</sup> shewn to be sacred, and may well be accounted such because importing an Authority to exercise that of God; but to let them know, as St. Paul speaks in the place but now quoted, that in strict and proper speech God is the *only Potentate*, and that therefore they ought to demean themselves as those who are but his *Ministers*, and who exercise rather another's dominion than their own. Which will consequently oblige them to have a regard to his Laws, and square all their

own



own by them. And though where God affirms <sup>a</sup>, that *he hath given the earth to the Children of men*, he may seem to have parted with the Dominion thereof from himself; Though that may seem yet more probable from his *there* asserting the Heavens to himself, that implying or seeming to imply that the Earth which he hath so given is now no longer his: Yet, if we compare that passage with others, we shall find the *gift* before spoken of to be rather of its use or emolument, as that too, not without a power of infringing or revoking it; He, who affirms himself to have given the Earth to the Children of men, not only elsewhere styling himself the *Lord* of it, but declaring moreover all the Cattle of the Earth to be his own <sup>v</sup>, that, if he had any occasion of them, he should not need to come to man for them, or pray his restoring of them. If God may sometime seem to speak otherwise, as he must be acknowledg'd to do where he gives man <sup>2</sup> dominion over the Creatures, yet is that of necessity to be understood with subordination to that of God, and rather to shew what subjection man may claim from it, from and under God, than that the dominion thereof is really in himself. For if God be the *Lord* of the Earth, man must be very improperly and equivocally such, and indeed, only so far as to claim subjection from it in Gods name, and so long as he shall be pleas'd to allow him. But from hence it will follow, which is the cause I have hitherto insisted upon it, that we ought to own it as an effect of his bounty if we continue to enjoy this supposed dominion, and be as far from repining at it if he please to take it away; That we ought not to think we any way oblige him, if we present him with any part of it, because (as *David* speaks <sup>a</sup>) we do but give him *of his own*; nor yet be backward, because it is his, to dispose of it as he prescribes; In fine, that we neither lay up this our *talent* in a Napkin, or mispend it, as knowing that we must account for it to him who is the *Lord* both of *us* and *it*.

<sup>a</sup> Psa. 115. 16.

<sup>v</sup> Psa. 50. 10.  
<sup>c</sup> 6.

<sup>2</sup> Gen. 1. 28.

<sup>a</sup> Chro. 29.  
<sup>14</sup>

An account being thus given of the extent of Gods dominion in respect of those subjects over which it reacheth, we should now, according to our proposed method, consider it as to those acts by which it may be exercised upon them. But because this is a question which is not of easy solution, and beside that, considering those gracious compacts by which he hath impair'd his own Dominion, not so necessary to be determin'd, I shall content my self to observe,

1. That as there are some Creatures which are in a capacity to know and do his will, as well as to be controuled by it, so it must therefore be look'd upon as within the compass of his Dominion to command them to conform to it: This as it is but the natural result of his Dominion which implies Empire as well as controul, so containing nothing of iniquity in it, and by which therefore we cannot suppose it at all to be prejudg'd.
2. But neither shall I stick to affirm, that it is within the compass of his dominion to punish those who disobey his Commands, as well as to lay his commands upon them: All Empire being in vain, where there is not an Authority to punish whatsoever shall be found to contradict it.
3. I shall adde thirdly, because equally safe and true, that this Dominion of God extends to the enjoyning or doing of all those things which are not impossible in themselves, or inconsistent with the other perfections of his nature. But as farther than that I shall not adventure

to go in assigning the extent of this dominion (for who should dare to do that, when we find men, not without Authority from the Scripture, affixing the same limits to his power?) so neither will I approach so near toward the impairing of it, as to take upon me to determine what is consistent or inconsistent with Gods perfections. And certainly had the great asserters of Gods dominion that regard which they ought to have for those perfections, they also would be as careful how they enlarg'd that Dominion to their prejudice, and particularly to the prejudice of Gods goodness: This as it is an attribute in which he seems more to delight, than in all other the perfections of his nature, so being that which induceth us to the Adoration of the other, and of him who is adorned with them. But how much more reasonable as well as more safe would it be, to acknowledge that God may do *to* and *with* us what he pleaseth, but withall that we are ignorant what is or may be well pleasing to him? for so though we should not it may be so *expressly* acknowledge the Dominion of God, yet we should acknowledge it as much another way, by confessing it to be incomprehensible; and, which is a thing not to be despis'd, do no dishonour to his other excellencies.

## And in Jesus.

### The Contents.

*Of the importance of the name Jesus, and that it denotes him, on whom it is here impos'd, to save his people from their sins. Enquiry thereupon made, how he saves us from our sins, which he is shewn to do as to their pollution, and guilt, and punishment. Evidence of the first of these from his being the founder of a religion, more particularly from the design of the whole oeconomy of our redemption, which is shewn to be to prompt men to discard sin, from his obliging men under the severest penalties to the practice of the contrary virtues, and from his furnishing men with power to subdue it. The like evidence of his saving us from the guilt and punishment of sin. The Conclusion.*

### And in Jesus.

I Have insisted hitherto upon that part of the Creed, which is upon the matter *natural*, and which accordingly I have for the most part made use of *natural* reasons to confirm, as which are the most proper to establish it: I come now to that part of it, which is more peculiarly *Christian*, and wherein, generally speaking, no other Religion hath any thing common with it. Where, following the order of nature as well as of the Creed, we will first of all entreat of him, who is *the principal object*, as well as the *founder* of our faith.

Now though I no way doubt, but that, when we are requir'd to believe *in Jesus*, we are first of all to understand the believing that there was such a person to whom that Appellation is attributed; Partly, because that Appellation was primarily intended as his name, and partly, because all that

that follows concerning his qualifications, actions, or passions, presuppose the being of him of whom they are affirm'd: Yet am I as far from thinking it to have been the only thing intended by those who were the Compilers of the Creed; The name of *Jesus*, however primarily intended to denote his person, yet being, by the intention of God, to denote the design of his coming into the World, and for which we are invited to believe in him. Which design being not elsewhere expressed in the Creed, it is but reasonable to think it was intended here, and we therefore, especially having before established the other, to enquire into the importance of it, and what this August name of his instructs us to believe.

<sup>a</sup> Digression concerning the truth of Christian Religion, &c.

And here not to admonish, because that is now sufficiently evident; that *Jesus* in the *Greek* is the same with *Joshua* in the *Hebrew*, and accordingly both by the Septuagint, and the Writers of the New Testament<sup>b</sup> set to express it; As neither (because that is alike known and confessed) that *Joshua* in the *Hebrew* comes from the *Verb* *yw* which signifies to *save*, and must accordingly denote him a *Saviour*, upon whom it shall be found to be impos'd with reference to the importance of it; I shall choose rather to enquire, what kind of Saviour it imports, when apply'd to *our own Jesus*. For though the *Etymology* of the word will give us no insight into that, yet the stories of our Saviour will, because assuring us from the mouth of that Angel, by whose authority it was impos'd, that he should be called *Jesus*<sup>c</sup> because he should *save his people from their sins*. Within that therefore as the true notion of our *Jesus's* Salvation is to be thought to stand, so I will accordingly make it my business to enquire into his saving us from the pollution or guilt or punishment thereof, which are all the ways imaginable of any ones saving us from our sins.

<sup>b</sup> Act. 7. 45. Heb. 4. 8.

<sup>c</sup> Mat. 1. 21.

I. To begin with the first of these, because least considered, and because in strict and proper speech the *only* saving us from our sins; Where first of all I cannot but wonder, that men, who make profession of Christianity, should think this not to have been a part, yea a principal part of its Authors design. For was that doctrine, which was denominated from him, a *Religion*, or not? If it were not, how comes it to pass that it should prompt us first of all to *believe in God*, and to look upon him as our *Maker* and *Lord*? This naturally prompting us to yield obedience to his commands, but especially to those which have an intrinsick goodness in them, and which, so long as we continue in those relations wherein we stand, is not possible to be separated from them. How comes it to pass that the Author of this salutary doctrine professeth himself to have come not to *seek his own glory* but *the glory of him that sent him*, to represent himself as the *way* unto the Father, and *to whom they could not otherwise come but by him*? Lastly, how comes he to commend himself to the world upon the account of his own obedience to the will of God, and prompt *that* to yield the like obedience to it? For what more convincing proofs can we desire of such a Doctrine being truly and properly a Religion, a Doctrine which had for its design the exciting men to the performance of their duty, and directing men in the doing of it? And shall we not then think it to have been a part, yea a principal part of its Authors design to save men from their sins, that is to say, from the commission of them? Can it otherwise with any reason assume to it self the name of a Religion, can it in any tolerable measure be look'd upon



upon as such? For however Religion may be suppos'd to consult also the benefit of its Professors, yet not without subordination to the glory of him who is the principal object of it; and though it may in like manner have a regard to *their* infirmities, yet neither suffer such infirmities upon them as may take them off altogether from religious actions, nor allow wilful omissions of them: This being to common understandings not a *relaxation* of Religion, but its *overthrow*, a thing which may perhaps assume to it self the *name* of Religion, but under that name *impugn* it. So little reason is there to doubt, if we consider Christianity only as a Religion, of its designing to secure men from offending against him who is the principal object both of its self and all. But how much less reason shall we find to doubt of it, if we do more intimately consider of it, and those arguments which it affords us of the pioufness as well as the salutariness of its design?

Now there are three things which Christianity offers us towards the proof of that Salvation from sin, which we are now upon the consideration of,

1. That one great end of the whole Oeconomy of our redemption was to prompt men to discard sin.
2. That he, by whom our redemption was accomplished, hath renew'd our obligation to the contrary, as that too, under the penalty of being excluded out of Heaven, if we conform not to it.
3. That he hath furnish'd men with power to subdue sin.

I. And here not to content my self with such general proofs of the first of these, as that which St. Paul <sup>d</sup> presents us with where he presseth the discarding of all iniquity; That I mean, which imports that our Saviour *gave himself to redeem us from it, and to purify to himself a peculiar people zealous of good works*: I shall desire it may be considered what there is in this great Oeconomy which may not be thought to have design'd the redeeming us from iniquity it self, as well as from its guilt and punishment. I instance in that first, which may seem of all others farthest removed from it because notoriously design'd to free us from the guilt of it. But that *that* was not the whole of its design is evident from St. Peter <sup>e</sup>, even where he takes notice of that comfortable effect of it. For *he himself* (saith that Apostle) *bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead unto sin, might live unto righteousness*. If he intended, as undoubtedly he did, to deliver us from those evils to which our offences had made us obnoxious, yet not without a design to oblige us also to die unto them, and requite his removal of our past guilt by endeavouring for the future to avoid it. From the death of Christ therefore pass we to his resurrection, and which also must be confess'd to have intended the freeing us from our guilt, or rather from that punishment which followed upon it. But who knows not, or at least may not, that *that* also had for its design the ushering in of such a life as was not only contrary to sin, but left no place for its return? For *we are buried with him* (saith St. Paul <sup>f</sup>) *by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life*; As that too, not for a time only, and with a reservation of returning afterwards to our old offences, because *knowing* <sup>g</sup> *that Christ, who is the pattern of this our new life, being raised from the dead dieth no more, death hath no more dominion over him.*

For

<sup>d</sup> Tit. 2. 14.

<sup>e</sup> 1 Pet. 2. 24.

<sup>f</sup> Rom. 6. 4.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid.—9.

For which cause the same Apostle doth presently after subjoin <sup>b</sup> that we <sup>b</sup> *ibid* — 11. likewise should reckon our selves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive, yea always alive unto God (for so the preceeding verses perswade) through Jesus Christ our Lord. But it may be the Ascension of Christ had not this pious design in its eye, as being too much taken up with the intending of his own promised glories, and providing fit Mansions for his Disciples. So they perhaps may be willing to think who have no mind to ascend heaven-wards in their affections or thoughts, or at least, not till their departure hence. But that St. Paul was of another mind, his admonishing men <sup>i</sup> that if they be risen with Christ they should both seek <sup>i</sup> Col. 3. 1, 2. those things that are above, and set their affections there, may serve for an abundant evidence; This passage of his not obscurely intimating that we ought to imitate our Saviour in his Ascension as well as his Resurrection, and leaving all earthly and sinful practices, of which he immediately after <sup>k</sup> gives a particular account, pant after the piety as well as the happiness that is in Heaven, and have our conversation there. For that this was also intended by the things above, his not only giving unto Fornication and other the like sins the name of our members upon the earth shews, but a passage of the same Apostle elsewhere <sup>l</sup>: He there <sup>l</sup> Phil. 3. 19, 20. telling those he wrote to, that whereas many, who call'd themselves Christians, minded earthly things; and those sins that were conversant about them, his and other true Christians conversation was in heaven, from whence also they look'd for the Saviour, even the Lord Jesus Christ. The only considerable part of the Oeconomy of our redemption yet unconsidered is that which was the Prologue to all the rest, I mean our Saviours manifestation in the flesh. But even here, no less than in the other, shall we be able to discern that most excellent design of our Saviour in destroying as well as attoning for our offences. For ye know, saith St. John <sup>m</sup>, that he was manifested to take away sin, and <sup>m</sup> 1 Joh. 3. 5. in him is no sin. As in like manner <sup>n</sup> that for this very purpose was the <sup>n</sup> — 8. son of God manifested, that he might destroy the works of the Devil. And indeed, setting aside what he afterwards did in order to it, discountenancing all impiety both by his precepts and example, and tending no man the forgiveness of sin of whom he did not first exact repentance from it; his very Conception and Birth carried evident marks upon them of that design: The Womb of a Virgin being made use of for that purpose, and that Womb impregnated by the Holy Ghost. Even the embraces of the Marriage-bed, though innocent in themselves, were not yet thought fit to bear a part in the production of him. For being a mystery of Purity and Godliness, as St. Paul <sup>o</sup> expressly styles it, it seem'd but reasonable it should be founded in that which was most strictly such, and be free not only from impurity but from the suspicion of it. And yet as if that had not been enough, this Virgin Womb was also impregnated by the Holy Ghost, and the purity of the Dove added to that of the other. So that which way soever we turn our eyes, we can discern nothing of the least impurity, no nor any thing which doth not apparently discountenance it: A Virgin and a Dove, the emblems of innocence and purity, supporting that veil which is drawn before this great mystery. Being then it was the design of this and all other the parts of the Oeconomy of our redemption to discountenance sin, and incite men to all Piety and Vertue, being they were intended as so many Emblemes of, and obligations to it, it is but reasonable to resolve the

Author

Author thereof to have been a Saviour from sin, and from the filth and corruption of it.

2. I will not say much concerning that second argument Christianity furnisheth us with, to shew our Saviour to have design'd the saving us from our sins: Because however in truth the most full and cogent, yet it hath elsewhere <sup>p</sup> had its due weight, and what I now design to prove been as firmly established by it. It may suffice here to observe, that as Christ came not to destroy but to confirm the Moral Law, yea moreover to fulfil and add to it; so in the close of that Sermon, whose design is to establish it, he appropriates that Kingdom of Heaven <sup>q</sup>, which he promulgated, to the *doers of that his Fathers Will*, and excludes *the workers of iniquity* from it <sup>r</sup> and him. For this shews him to have design'd so far the saving us from our sins, that he will not own us as his till he hath done so, and much less admit us to a participation of his glories. And indeed, as *Grotius* reasoned in his interpretation of those words of St. John <sup>t</sup>, *and ye know that he was manifested to take away sin*, that we are tacitely to understand, that in case we frustrate this purpose of our Saviour, we shall certainly offend him in it, and therefore ought not to hope for glory and eternal life by him; so that reasoning of his seems to me to be so strong that it would have invalidated the sinners hopes, though our Saviour himself had not before damn'd them by any express declaration: To allow men to expect pardon and glory without a resolution at least to abandon their sins, being the ready way to frustrate his own design of removing them, as which men would not concern themselves much about, if they were assur'd they should not suffer by them. For be it, that *Gratitude* were a forcible motive in it self, nay be it that it would have been look'd upon as a sufficient one by men who carry nothing about them of an inclination to sin; yet can it not be thought such with those who have the remains of corruption in them, and whose weaknesses and corruptions are sometimes aggravated even to the scandal of our Religion: Of which, besides others, we have this lamentable proof, that even they who believe sin to be as damning as it is ungrateful, find themselves sometime put to it to subdue it. For well may Gratitude be thought to be no sufficient restraint in it self, when it proves too often ineffectual, even when assisted with a promise of happiness, and which it may be is more effectual than either, a denunciation of eternal vengeance. If they, with whom this motive of Gratitude seems to be of so great force, find it to be such in their own lives, I shall not be at all sorry for it, because an evidence of a greater goodness than is ordinarily to be found in the Sons of men. But as I must profess my self not to have been able to discover any such effects of it, as should oblige other men to make it the only principle of their obedience; so I shall never persuade my self that Gratitude is the only thing that influenceth them, till I see the laws of Christianity with their respective sanctions razed out of their Bibles: These, however they may not be considered, when men are serving an Hypothesis, yet being not so inconsiderable in themselves, as not to strike an awe into mens Consciences, and thereby contribute to the producing of that conformity which they require.

3. Now as however our Saviour may have design'd the saving us from our sins, and given proof of that design of his both in his own Oeconomy and Laws, yet that design would undoubtedly have been frustrated, if he had not furnish'd us with a power to subdue them; so I think it therefore

but

<sup>p</sup> *Introd. to the  
Explic. of the  
Decal. Disc. 3. 4.*

<sup>q</sup> *Mat. 7. 21.*

<sup>r</sup> *Ibid. vers. 23.*

<sup>t</sup> *1 Joh. 3. 5.*



but just to call you to the consideration of that, and of those evidences thereof which Christianity hath afforded us. For not to tell you, though I might, that there is evidence enough of such a power in the many obligations that are laid upon us to subdue them; He who obligeth us to subdue those, supposing it possible to do so, and therefore, if that be not so to our own natural force, that he will make it such by his Grace; We are sufficiently assur'd of it by his promise of the Holy Ghost, and the evidences he hath since given us of his bestowing it; This, as it is particularly remark'd for the power it hath over sin, yea, even to the *mortification* of it, so having given a proof of that its power from the first foundation of the Church to the present age. As by means of which men have been, and daily are, not only taken off from their former great extravagancies, but from sins of a lower nature, and which, before their conversion to Christianity, they made little scruple of. And if all this do not prove our *Jesus* to save his people from their sins, I know not what will or can; especially, when, what he hath so prompted, and oblig'd, and enabled men for, he hath actually accomplished, and deliver'd them from those the worst of Enemies. I say nothing at present, how much soever I may be tempted to it, in what measure our Saviour thus saves us, or we may think our selves obliged to be freed from our offences: Partly, because that will afterwards find a more proper place, and partly, because all I now aim to shew, is, that there is no expectation of being sav'd from the guilt and punishment, unless we be in some measure saved from the pollution of them. For that once secur'd, there will infallibly follow an endeavour after a freedom from them, and, because God is not wanting to us by his grace, such a freedom from them in effect, as may secure us of those other Salvations, which our *Jesus* hath accomplished, and which accordingly I come now to consider of.

<sup>1</sup> Rom. 8. 13.

<sup>2</sup> *Explicat. of that Article of our Creed, which imports Remission of Sins.*

II. For the clearing whereof we are next to know, that, as Sin, where it hath been committed, induceth an obligation to punishment best known by the name of *guilt*; so our *Jesus*, to shew himself perfectly such, hath delivered us from that, as well as from the pollution of it. Witness that forgiveness of Sins which he himself affirm'd himself to have the power of, and which accordingly those that followed him did by his Authority make Proclamation of; This cassating the obligation wherein we were before held, and delivering us from those fears which it occasions. And indeed as we are all willing to believe our *Jesus* to be thus a Saviour, and may we continue to believe so if we are as willing to be saved from the Sins themselves; So it is not to be deny'd, that this is one of the most usual notions of it. I appeal for the proof hereof to that account which *Zacharias* gave of it, and who indeed was one of the first that describ'd this Salvation to us. For not contented to explain it by performing <sup>1</sup> the mercy promised to our fathers, and Gods remembering his own holy covenant (of which the Author to the Hebrews tells us <sup>2</sup>, it was an especial part, that God would be merciful to mens unrighteousness, and remember their sins and iniquities no more): Whom he comes to speak more particularly of the Baptist, and whom we know to have been sent before only to fit men for, and direct them to our Saviour, he makes the effect of his Message to be <sup>3</sup> that he should give knowledge of salvation to his people by the remission of their sins; Which shews the Salvation, which he foretold, and our *Jesus* brought, to be a Salvation from guilt, and from all that misery and anguish which it would have occasion'd.

<sup>1</sup> Luc. 1. 72.

<sup>2</sup> Heb. 8. 12.

<sup>3</sup> Luc. 1. 77.

<sup>a</sup> Act. 5. 31.

tion'd. Agreeable hereunto is that of St. Peter <sup>a</sup>, and more than which I shall not now produce to shew this Jesus of ours to be thus a Saviour, and to have verified the importance of his name by it; It being the exprefs affirmation of that Holy man, that that *Jesus whom the Jews slew and hanged on a tree, him had God exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins.*

<sup>b</sup> Heb. 9. 28.

III. But so also may we be assur'd, because having the former Salvations as well as the word of God to warrant it, that this Jesus of ours shall shew himself yet more so, by actually saving us from the punishment of our Sins, and that arrear of vengeance which is reserved for the other world; There being no other evil whereof that of the Author to the Hebrews <sup>b</sup> can be understood, that *unto them which look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.* Only because the

<sup>c</sup> Phil. 3. 21.

<sup>d</sup> 1 Cor. 15. 53. &c.

name of Jesus can never be sufficiently exalted, nor we made sufficiently sensible of that benefit we are to reap by it, I think it but just to take notice of that Salvation which shall then accrue both to the one and other part of us. For thus for the *body* we are told; not only that it shall be rescued from the power of the Grave, and that darkness and gloominess that dwells upon it; but that, when this *Saviour and our Lord Jesus Christ shall appear from Heaven*, he shall save those bodies from *themselves*, and from those mean and ignoble qualities wherewith they are endow'd: It being the affirmation of St. Paul in the place but now alluded to <sup>c</sup> that *he shall change our vile bodies that they may be made like unto his glorious body*; As elsewhere <sup>d</sup>, that he shall change them from *mortal* to *immortal*, yea from *earthly* to *spiritual and heavenly*. And though, where St. Paul entreats of the happiness of glorious bodies, he doth not take notice of those eternal torments from which they are sav'd, yet are we to understand the Salvation here spoken of to be a Salvation from those also, because without that Salvation they would infallibly have

<sup>e</sup> 1 Cor. 5. 5.

fallen under them. It is in like manner evident from the Scripture <sup>e</sup>, that *the spirit shall be sav'd in the day of the Lord Jesus*, though, as it doth not exprefs from what evils it shall be so, so it is a great part of its happiness that it shall never perfectly know. It may be enough to it to understand, that as those evils are no other than what the damned shall suffer in their Souls, as from which the Salvation of Jesus is the only thing that can deliver it; So it is not difficult to collect how great those will be, from the anger of that God whom they have offended, the malice of the Devils who are appointed as their tormentors, and the stings and lashes of their own guilty Consciences. For from all this doth the name of *Jesus* deliver us, or rather he on whom that most salutary name was impos'd. And can there then be any regard too great for such a name, any esteem which will not fall below its merit? for a name to which I owe my present peace, and to which I shall one day owe so unspeakable a deliverance. I will *bow my knee*, yea I will *bow my heart* at it; it shall be the constant Companion of my joys and griefs; it shall eat, and drink, and sleep with me. In fine, I will labour so to fix it on my Soul, that it shall become a part of it, or at least inseparably united to it; That so, when my Soul shall leave my body, that may accompany it in its passage, and direct it to him to whom it doth belong.

And now behold the name of *Jesus* rais'd to its just height, and, as it were, lifted up with the brazen Serpent in the Wilderness. Do but look up to it with the eye of Faith, and you will find it as sovereign a remedy against

against the bitings of this fiery one. Is sin it self the thing that pains and troubles you, the stain and dominion of it? Believe in *Jesus*, for he came to save you from it, to rescue you out of the power of it. Whatsoever he did, or suffer'd, was in order to this end; whatsoever he spake was to turn you from it: In fine, to this end hath he given you of the graces of his spirit, and when that great day of the Lord *Jesus* and our Salvation shall come, he shall free you perfectly from it, and present you to his Father without the least *spot* or *wrinkle*. Again doth the guilt of sin disquiet your Soul, doth it fire your blood, and drink up your spirits? Believe in *Jesus*, for he came to save you from that also, by giving repentance to you and forgiveness of sins. For this end, as I shall afterwards shew, was this *Jesus* of ours born, for this end did he submit himself to so shameful and miserable a death; shedding his dearest blood, that he might appease his incensed Father, and reconcile you both to God and to himself. Lastly, is Death and Hell the object of your fears, those two last as well as worst effects and consequents of sin? Believe in *Jesus*, for he came to save you from these also, and shall one day rescue you out of the power of them: After which as there is no presumption of our falling again under it, so we are sufficiently secured from it by that immortal life into which we pass, and by the company of that *Jesus* who shall bring us into it.

## Christ.

### The Contents.

*The word Christ considered as to the Scripture sense of it, and shewn to signifie one, who by the predictions of the Prophets, was to be anointed by God to be the Author of great deliverance to his people. To prove our Jesus to have been that Christ or anointed one, it is shewn first that that Christ or anointed one is already come; secondly, that our Jesus came into the World at the time appointed for the Christ, as thirdly that he hath all other the characters of that Christ upon him. The present discourse restrain'd to the Offices of that Christ, which are shewn to be, that of a King and Priest and Prophet. Evidences out of the Old Testament of Christs being to be a King, and our Jesus both shewn to be such, and the nature and Royalties of his Kingdom explain'd. The like evidence out of the Old Testament concerning his Priestly function, and our Jesus shewn more particularly to be a Priest by the Sacrifice he made of himself upon the Cross. The prophetic Office of Christ in like manner evidenced out of the Old Testament, and our Jesus both shewn to have been a Prophet, and the Jews exception against his being such from his going about to destroy the law answered.*

**A**S I am not without hopes from the glorious things that have been *Christ* already declar'd, that men will be thereby stirred up to a farther inquisition after him, to whom they have been demonstrated to belong;



so I shall therefore hope, because the design of this discourse is to allake that thirst, that they will accompany me at least so far as the declaration of that Dignity and Office to which he was anointed by the Almighty: This as I shall by and by shew to have been the importance of the word *Christ*, which comes in the next place to be considered, so tending not a little to confirm that *salvation* of his, which we have already been persuaded to believe. Taking it therefore for granted, that the Argument we have now before us will not unwillingly be attended to, I will set my self to shew,

1. What the general importance of the word *Christ* is.
2. Prove our Jesus to have been the person denoted by that name.
3. Enquire more particularly what it is to be the *Christ*, and shew our Jesus to have been such.

I. Of the general importance of the word *Christ* much need not be said, because it is agreed on by Etymologists, that it is as much as *Anointed*; by Divines whether Jewish or Christian, that it is in the *Scripture sense* one *Anointed by God to be the Author of great deliverance to his people*, and is the same in the Greek as *Messiah* in the Hebrew, as both the *στυμον* of either name<sup>a</sup>, and one of our Saviours Disciples instructs us; he telling<sup>b</sup> his Brother *Simon*, and in him us, that he had found the *Messiah*, which is being interpreted the *Christ*. The only question between the Jews and us is, whether, as there was one Anointed one to whom the Prophets did more particularly refer, so our Jesus be the person.

משח: משיח  
anxit χριστός  
à χριστός ungo.  
Joh. 1. 41.

II. For the evidencing whereof, though it be of no small moment to alledge, that he, whom we pretend to have been this *anointed* one, affirm'd himself to be so, (for well may we alledge his Affirmation as a proof, whom I have elsewhere<sup>c</sup> shewn to have been so signally witness'd to by God) yet because our Saviour himself was contented to have that Anointing of his tried by the Prophecies of the Old Testament, but, to be sure, they with whom we have to do will not allow of any other proofs, I will evince our Jesus to have been the *Christ* from those their own Scriptures, and from known and undoubted Stories. In order whereunto I will shew first, that the *Messiah* or *Christ* is already come, and secondly, that our Jesus is he.

<sup>b</sup> Digression concerning the truth of Christian Religion, &c.

<sup>a</sup> Gen. 49: 10.

I. That the *Messiah* or *Christ* is already come, I shall prove first from that known Prophecy of *Jacob*<sup>d</sup>, that *the Scepter should not depart from Judah, nor a Lawgiver from between his knees until Shiloh come*. For inasmuch as the Scepter is long since departed from *Judah*, neither hath there for many hundreds of years been any Lawgiver between his feet, it will unavoidably follow that the *Messiah* is already come, if he be the person meant by *Shiloh*. Which that he is, we have the testimony of their own most Authentick writings, to wit their three *Targums*, the *Talmud* and several of their *Rabbins*, as may be seen at large in *Helvicius's* discourse upon that Prophecy. And accordingly we find some of their own great *Doctors*<sup>e</sup> astonished at the consideration of this Prophecy, and in effect confessing themselves to have been in an error for expecting him yet to come. For *wo unto us* (saith one of them in the *Jerusalem Talmud*) *because the Scepter is departed from Judah, and yet the Son of David is not come, and we have not at present* (saith another) *either Kings or Princes*: As *Kimchi* (a man of all others the greatest Enemy to Christianity, as one well vers'd in the Jewish writings, tells us<sup>f</sup>) *These are the days*

<sup>e</sup> Vid. Helvicum de Vari-  
cinio Jacobi.

<sup>f</sup> Pocock. Appen-  
d. ad Port.  
Mosis. cap. 8.

days of banishment in which we now live, neither have we either King or Prince of Israel, but we are under the power of the Gentiles, and under the power of their Kings and Princes. Which what is it but to confess, unless they will give God and the Prophet the lie, that the Messiah is already come? Though setting those testimonies aside (which yet are not only good testimonies against the Jews, but of great force as to our selves, because representing to us the tradition of the Jewish Church, and than which it is impossible to find out a better interpreter of the Scripture) That one Character of this Shiloh; that to him should the gathering or obedience of the Gentiles be, will serve for an abundant evidence. For when (as I shall afterwards shew) this is made the particular Character of the Messiah, and that too, in such places as are by themselves interpreted of him; when there is moreover none of those, whom the latter Jews would have to be Shiloh, to whom that Character can be attributed; It must be prejudice rather than any well grounded reason to deny that Shiloh to be the Messiah, and consequently that the Messiah is already come. Unless we will perhaps admit of that subterfuge of theirs, which is indeed the only one left them, that for *their sins* this Messiah of theirs hath been defer'd. But beside that the Prophecy is not conditional but absolute, as also all those are that I shall produce; Beside secondly, that, if this evasion were to be admitted, it were easy to elude all Prophecies whatsoever; Beside thirdly, that it is a rule of their own *Maimonides* <sup>t</sup>, and by him borrowed from their *Doctors*, that as often as God promiseth good things by his Prophets, it cannot be but that he should perform them, according to that saying of our Ancestors, *Whatsoever proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord for good, yet doth he not recal it, though there be a condition added*, which he afterwards confirms farther, as to Prophecies simply and absolutely expressed, because *there would not otherwise be any means to distinguish between true and false*: Besides these, I say, which though more general Answers are yet no contemptible ones, how can the coming of the Messiah be said to be deferred because of their sins, when the very design of the Messiah was <sup>h</sup> to make reconciliation for iniquity and bring in everlasting righteousness? Unless (as *Grotius* well argues) <sup>i</sup> any man can think it reasonable to defer that, which was designed for a remedy, because of the malignity of the Disease. Let it remain therefore for an undoubted truth, that the Scepter is departed from *Judah*, and consequently that the *Messiah* or *Christ* is come.

The same is no less evident from that as known Prophecy of *Haggai*, from the sixth Verse of the second Chapter to the ninth. For *thus saith the Lord of Hosts, yet once it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land. And I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of Hosts — Yea the glory of this latter house shall be greater than that of the former, saith the Lord of Hosts, and in this place will I give peace, saith the Lord of Hosts*. For neither can this desire of all Nations be interpreted of any other than the Messiah, and to whom, as *Jacob* before foretold, the gathering of the Nations should be; neither can we fancy the glory of the latter House preferable to that of the former, unless it were by the coming of the Messiah into it: This latter House, as hath been observ'd by many, and is evident in part from the old mens weeping <sup>k</sup> at the foundation of it, being no way comparable to the former for outward splendor, and much less for internal

<sup>t</sup> Praefat. in Seder Zeraim. pag. 24, 25. apud Port. Mo-  
fis.

<sup>h</sup> Dan. 9. 24.

<sup>i</sup> De veritate religionis Christianae.

<sup>k</sup> Ezra 9. 12.

<sup>1</sup> Vid. Hulf. Theolog. Jud. dai. li. 1. Part 1. pag. 152.

<sup>2</sup> Hulf. ibid. Part 2. p. 515.

<sup>3</sup> Mal. 3. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Vid. Hulf. Theolog. Jud. ubi supra. pag. 278. ; ubi hanc prophetiam explicat & descendit.

<sup>5</sup> Dan. 9. 24. &c.

<sup>6</sup> Dan. 10. 2.

<sup>7</sup> Joseph. Antiqu. Jud. li. 10. c. ult. prope finem.

internal privileges ; as which wanted the Ark with the Cherubins (for so they themselves <sup>1</sup> acknowledge) the oyl of Unction, fire from Heaven, or the Majestick presence, Urim and Thummim, and the Holy Ghost, or Spirit of Prophecy. For which cause *Abarbinel*, a man of no small reputation among the Jews, found himself oblig'd to interpret the latter House not of the second Temple but of a third <sup>2</sup>, but with what violence to the text any man may see that will look into it. Now forasmuch as by the foregoing Prophecy the desire of all Nations or Messiah was to come in the time of the second Temple, which Temple is now long since utterly destroyed ; either there was no truth in that Prophecy, which Religion forbids us to believe, or he who was so foretold hath long since come into it. Conformable hereto is that of the Prophet *Malachi* <sup>3</sup>, and which, because more explicit, will serve for a comment upon the other. *Behold I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me : And the Lord whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the Messenger of the Covenant, in whom ye delight. Behold he shall come, saith the Lord of Hosts :* It being not only we who understand the Messiah by that Lord, but *Rabbi Kimchi* <sup>4</sup> also, and that too, not without warrant from the text it self; there being no other, to whom we can give those Elogies of *whom ye seek*, the *Angel of the Covenant*. and *him in whom ye delight*. For whom do even the present Jews seek after, or pretend to delight in, but the promised Messiah ? Nay do they not depend upon him for all the good things they expect, and particularly for a deliverance from their present evils ? As that too, not without a regard to the Covenant of God, and of which therefore they may well allow us to stile him the Angel or Messenger.

I alledge lastly that eminent Prophecy of *Daniel* <sup>5</sup>, which respects the Messiah and his cutting off, together with that of their own City and Nation. For *seventy weeks* (saith he) *are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy City, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy. Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the Commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks the streets shall be built again and the wall in troublous times. And after threescore and two weeks the Messiah shall be cut off, but not for himself, and the people of the Prince that shall come shall destroy the City and the Sanctuary, and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined.* For however this Prophecy be not without its difficulties as to the particular computations, which yet he who lists may see fairly assail'd by *Grotius* : yet as it is agreed upon between the Jews and us, that the weeks there spoken of are weeks of years, for which cause when the Prophet comes afterwards to speak of weeks properly so call'd, he entitles them *weeks of days* <sup>6</sup> ; so it is manifest from the Prophecy that the Messiah should both appear and be cut off near the expiration of that term, and before the destruction of their City and Temple. Which last having hapned so many hundreds of years past, and that too as *Josephus* <sup>7</sup> observes, agreeably to the Prophecies of *Daniel*, it is but necessary they should also grant that the Messiah is long since come, which is that we are now to prove against them. And indeed, as I no way doubt, but what seems so convictive to us would appear so also



also to the Jews if they would take it into their serious thoughts; so I am the more confirmed in it, because of a way that hath of late been found out to put by the force of these and such like arguments. For were it not that they were afraid they should be gravell'd by those Texts which respect the time, why should they make it a fundamental Article of their Faith *to wait for him though he tarried never so long*, yea not to derogate so far from their own waiting as *to expound Scriptures so, as to collect the time of his coming from them*? Especially when there are so many Texts, which do apparently respect the Messiah and the time of his coming, and which anciently were so interpreted by themselves: This being in effect to confess that they know not what to say to them, and that therefore they are resolv'd not to trouble their heads about them. Neither will it avail to say, as *Maimonides*<sup>1</sup> seems willing to intimate, that they ground this caution of theirs upon a passage of the Prophet *Habacuc*, and which indeed is the only thing that is brought by them to establish it. For though it be there<sup>2</sup> said, *though it tarry wait for it*, or as *Maimonides* and the Author to the Hebrews<sup>3</sup> doth, though he, even the Messiah, *tarry wait for him*; yet is it also said in the very same Verse, that the *Vision is for an appointed time*, and that *it will surely come, it will not tarry*. Which shews evidently, that his tarrying and their waiting should be only till the appointed time, and that they should not think the time *between* long. But what is this to the expectation of him after the time appointed is come, or to the not computing of it, supposing that to be doubtful? For as our expectation must needs be render'd unnecessary by the *coming* of that which we waited for; so it is possible to wait for this promise of the Father, and yet endeavour to find out the time of its accomplishment: Because this may be done only to strengthen our Faith, or satisfy our selves whether the time of *that waiting* be not over, and miserable we look for a Messiah yet to come, when we ought to adore him who already is. As in truth, wherefore should God be so particular in setting down the time of his coming, but to direct us to prepare for him (and then certainly it will be but necessary to compute the time of his coming) or to help us to know him when he is?

2. Having thus shewn at large that the *Messiah* or *Christ* is already come, and, by the by, also the unreasonableness or rather craft of the Jews in teaching men not to compute the time of his coming, pass we on to prove that our *Jesus* is he. Now that I shall endeavour,

1. From the time of our Saviours appearing, and the agreement there was between that and the time foretold. It was affirm'd of old by *Jacob*, that the *Scepter should not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his knees until Shiloh came*; Which points out the time of the Messiah's coming to be before the Jewish polity should be quite extinct. But within this time it is manifest from Story that our Saviour came, there being some face of a Common-wealth among them till their utter destruction by *Vespasian*. For though they had not Kings as at the first, nor Princes as at the beginning, that is to say, of the Tribe of *Judah* and of the Family of *David*, the Princes that rul'd over them being Heathen when our Saviour came into the world; yet was their *Sanhedrim* or Great Council of great Authority, and in truth little less than Regal, as appears from what is said by several of their *Rabbins* concerning their questioning *Herod* the Great for his life. From the Prophecy of *Jacob* pass we to that of *Haggai*, and, which is parallel to it, that of the Pro-

<sup>1</sup> Maimon. Praefat. ad Perck Chelek. seu cap. 10. Tractat. Sanhedrim, pag. 176. ed. Pocock.

<sup>2</sup> Fundamentum duodecimum est, Dies Messianica: ut credat quis & persusum habeat venturum ipsum, neque illum tardare putet, si tardaverit expectet eum, nec illi terminum constituat, aut ita exponat textus Scripturae, ut ex iis tempus adventus ipsius eliciat.

<sup>3</sup> Maimon. loca citato.

<sup>4</sup> Hab. 2. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Heb. 10. 37.

<sup>6</sup> Vid. Helvic. de Vaticinio Jacobi.

phet *Malachi*, both which are expresse for the Messiah's coming in the age of, and to visit the second Temple. But so it is certain, that he, whom we own for the Messiah, did, not only entring into it for devotions sake, but to exercise Authority in it, and to drive the buyers and sellers out of it. It is alike manifest lastly, which is the importance of the third Prophecy, that the Messiah was to come within 70. weeks after the going forth of the decree to rebuild *Jerusalem*, and a little before the destruction of it, both which are as known of our Blessed Saviour, and of him whom we own for our Messiah. And though the present Jews are no way moved by these Prophecies, or the time which they seem to decipher, yet it is manifest that the elder Jews were otherwise perswaded, yea so far as to believe the Messiah should appear about that age wherein we know our Lord and Saviour did. For to say nothing at all of that *Nehumias*, of

<sup>2</sup> Grot. de Veritate Relig. Christianæ, li. 5. sect. 14.

whom *Grotius* speaks <sup>2</sup>, and concerning whom he tells us, that, as he liv'd about 50. years before our Saviour, so he expressly affirm'd, that the time set by *Daniel* for the coming of the Messiah, could not be protracted

<sup>3</sup> Sueton. in Vita Vespasiani Patris. Percrebuerat oriente toto vetus & consans opinio esse in satis, ut eo tempore Judæa profectis rerum potirentur. Id de Imperio Romano, quantum eventu potestæ patuit, predictum, Judæi ad strabentes rebellarent.

*Tacitus Hist. li. 5. Pluribus persuasum inerant, antiquis Sacerdotum literis contineri, eo ipso tempore fore ut valeret Oriens profectiq; Judæa rerum potirentur. Quæ ambages Vespasianum ac Titum prædixerant.*

<sup>4</sup> Joseph. de Bello Judaico li. 7. Τὸ δὲ ἰσχυρὸν αὐτῶν μέγιστον παρὰ τὸν ὄλεον ἦν χρησιμὸς ἀμφοτέρων ὁμοίως ἐν τοῖς ἱερωῖς ὑπομνήμασι, οἱ καὶ τὴν κατὰ τὸν ἱερεὺς τῆς αὐτῶν ἀρχῆς τὸ δικαίωμα. Τότε οἱ μὲν οὐκ ὡς ἐβίβαντες, ἀλλὰ πολλοὶ τῶν σοφῶν ἐπλανήθησαν πρὸς τὸν κελσὸν. Ἐδύλετο δ' αὖτα τὸ πρὸς οὐσιπασίαν τὸ λόγιον ἡγεμονίαν, ἀποδείχθη δὲ ὅτι Ἰουδαίᾳ αὐτοὶ κρείττους.

beyond that time; It is the affirmation of two Heathen Authours, <sup>a</sup> with whom *Josephus* <sup>b</sup> consents, that it was the constant opinion of the Jews, that in that age of the world one from *Judæa* should reign not only over that Nation, but over the World. For thus *Suetonius* in the Life of *Vespasian* the elder tells us, that there was in all the East an ancient and constant opinion, that some from *Judæa* should sway the Scepter. And *Cornelius Tacitus*, that there was in many of the Jews a perswasion, led thereunto by the Antient books of their Priests, that the East Country should prevail, and some from *Judæa* (but *Josephus* more particularly, one from their Country) should govern all. Which however interpreted by them and *Josephus* of *Vespasian*, the former the better to

patronize his own error concerning the Messiah; yet was undoubtedly by the generality of the Jews interpreted concerning the Messiah or Christ, he being represented to them as a Prince, and by themselves believ'd to be a temporal one. As indeed who ever among them, beside the Messiah, was believ'd to be destin'd to the Monarchy of the World, or concerning whom it may be thought that there should be so ancient and constant an opinion concerning it, as both *Suetonius* and *Tacitus* assure us that there was? Though if we desire a yet farther proof both of that their meaning and the general expectation of the Jews, we have for a proof not only a multitude of their own Nation owning our Saviour as such, but others of them <sup>c</sup> *Herod* (from whom the *Herodians* in Scripture took their name) as others again in the time of *Adrian Barchochebas*. For this shews yet more clearly that that was the expected time of the Messiah's coming, and consequently, because those whom they look'd upon as such did no way deserve that title, that our Jesus is he. For who is there of those that hath left a Sect behind him to perpetuate his memory, and much less to invite all the world to do him homage; yea oblige Kings and Princes to lay their Scepters at his feet? Since therefore it is manifest that the *Messiah* or *Christ* is long since come; since it is no less, that he,

<sup>c</sup> Vid. Grot. de Veritate Religion. Christianæ, li. 5. sect. 17.

he, whom we acknowledge as such, came at the time appointed for that Messiah, and when even those that refus'd him thought themselves bound to expect one; Lastly, since it is manifest that no other hath as yet pretended to that Dignity, who could be thought to deserve that, or rival him; it follows that (as the Creed instructs us) we add *Christ* to *Jesus*, that we believe him not only to be a Saviour but the promised one, even that Messiah whom the Prophets foretold should come, and all good men ever desir'd to see.

2. The like evidence there is of our Saviours being the promised Messiah, from the agreement there is between them as to their respective natures, functions, birth, passion and other particularities which are remembered both in the Old and New Testament. For which cause I will now go on to enquire more particularly,

III. What it is to be *the Christ*, and shew our Saviour to have been such.

For the clearing whereof (because the term of *Messias* or *Anointed* is derived to us from the Jews) it will again be necessary for us to enquire of what use this Ceremony was among them, to what dignities or offices it assign'd them. Now there were three sorts of persons among the Jews who were initiated into their offices by this Ceremony of *Uction* or *Anointing*, to wit the King, the Priest, and the Prophet. Of the anointing of Kings there is frequent mention in the Old Testament, and therefore I shall the less need to insist upon it. For thus it is said of <sup>d</sup> *Saul* the first Prince or Monarch that people had, that *Samuel took a vial of oyl, and poured it upon his head, and said, Is it not because the Lord hath anointed thee to be captain over his inheritance?* that is to say, as the same *Samuel* doth afterwards interpret it, to be *King over his people Israel*. In like manner when God had now rejected *Saul*, and was about to substitute *David* in his room, he commanded the foremention'd Prophet <sup>f</sup> to fill his Horn with oyl, and go to the House of his Father *Jesse*: <sup>g</sup> *Whither being come, and David now produc'd, the youngest of that good old mans Sons, the Lord said unto him, Arise and anoint him, for this is he.* Next to the office of a *King* consider we that of a *Priest*, which we shall find to have had the same manner of inauguration; for so it was expressly enjoin'd by God himself <sup>h</sup> where he speaks of the holy anointing oyl. *For thou shalt anoint Aaron and his Sons, and consecrate them, that they may minister to me in the Priests office.* In compliance with which command, *Moses* the Prophet of the Lord, and to whom as such <sup>i</sup> that office did more peculiarly belong, consecrated *Aaron* into the High Priests office by <sup>j</sup> pouring oyl upon his head, as after his example, as we learn from tradition, the following Prophets did the Successors of *Aaron* till the destruction of the first Temple, after which time (as the Jews tell us) that Ceremony ceas'd <sup>k</sup> from among them, because of the loss of that anointing oyl which *Moses* had made for that purpose. Lastly, (for these things are too notorious to be long insisted on) as the King and the Priest were initiated into their offices by the Ceremony of Anointing, so also was the Prophet that perform'd that office to both the former, as we learn from a passage in the first Book of *Kings*: <sup>l</sup> *Elizah* having it in charge, that he should anoint *Hazael* to be King of Syria, *Jehu* the Son of *Nimshi* to be King over Israel, and *Elisha* the Son of *Shaphat* to be Prophet in his own stead. Now though from the forementioned uses of the Ceremony of anointing among the Jews it cannot be necessarily inferr'd that

<sup>d</sup> 1 Sam. 10. 1.<sup>e</sup> 1 Sam. 15. 1.<sup>f</sup> 1 Sam. 16. 1-12.<sup>g</sup> Exo. 30. 30.<sup>h</sup> Abarbin. in Comment. ad Exo. 30. apud Simeonem de Muis in Variis sacris.<sup>i</sup> Lev. 8. 12.<sup>k</sup> Abarbin. ubi supra.<sup>l</sup> 1 Kings 19. 15, 16.



the Messiah was to be all these, because represented to us under the term of *Anointed*; the term of Messiah or Anointed being competible to him, though he were only *King*, or *Priest*, or *Prophet*: Yet as it is reasonable to suppose he was to be one of these at the least, because the term of Anointed, and the Ceremony it self was in a manner restrain'd to these three Offices; so, if we consult the Scriptures, we shall find the Messiah was to be all these, and that there were as many designs of his inunction as there were of the Ceremony it self.

<sup>m</sup> Vid. Pocock. Append. ad Port. Mosi, c. 8.

<sup>n</sup> Pocock. *ibid.*

\* Praefat. ad Perek Chelek apud Port. Mosi, pa. 160.  
<sup>p</sup> Isa. 9. 6, 7.

Of the Messiah's being to be a *King* much need not be said, because this Office like the Rod of *Aaron* hath swallowed up all the rest, as well as the spirituality thereof. Only to satisfy our selves, as well as to furnish matter against the Jews, I think it but just to produce such Scriptures as give the surest establishment to it. Of this nature is that of the *Second Psalm*, where he is not only affirmed to be a *King*, but God brought in assuring him that he would give him the *Heathen* for his inheritance, and the utmost parts of the *Earth* for his possession. For that this *Psalm* is to be understood of the Messiah (beside the incompetibleness thereof to any other than him, and particularly to *David* to whom the modern Jews are willing to attribute it) is evident from the Expositions of the Ancient Doctors of the Jews, as those modern ones before-spoken of have expressly acknowledg'd. For thus *Rabbi Kimchi*, <sup>m</sup> *There are who interpret this Psalm of Gog and Magog, and the Messiah is King Messiah, and so our Doctors of happy memory have expounded it; Nay this Psalm (as he there goes on) so explain'd as clear.* Which makes it the more strange that he should adde notwithstanding, that it is *more near to truth to say, that David spake it of himself* according as he himself had expounded it. But as it is not unusual for the *Modern Jews*, to depart from the belief of the more *Ancient*, when they find it not to be for their turns; so *Rabbi Solomon Jarchi* hath perfectly remov'd that wonder, by telling us what induc'd them to it here. For after he had said that *their Doctors expounded this Psalm of the Messiah*, which therefore one would have thought should have made him wary how he departed from it, he adds <sup>n</sup>, *But as it sounds, and the better to answer the hereticks*, that is to say the Christians, *it is expedient to interpret it of David.* He saw well enough what advantage the Christians might make of it as to the proving from thence the consubstantiality of the Son with his Father God, and for that reason more than for any other it was to be wrested from them, yea even from that Messiah whom they themselves profess to own. For when ever did the Kings of the Earth so *take counsel* against *David*, as it is foretold they should against the King there mentioned? Or what appearance is there of Gods *giving him the heathen for his inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for his possession*? For if any counsel'd against him or were subjected to him, they were only those of his own neighbourhood: As for those who were remote, they were utterly ignorant of him, so far were they from either bowing to, or being broken by his Scepter. In the mean time well fare the memory of *Maimonides*, who as he was no way inferiour to the other in learning, so was superiour to them all in ingenuity and candour: He sticking not <sup>o</sup> to expound of the Messiah that which made the others wrest this whole *Psalm* from him, even those words of God to him, *Thou art my Son*. Agreeable hereto (so far I mean as the Kingship of the Messiah is concern'd) is that of the Prophet *Isaiab*, *Unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the government shall*

shall be upon his shoulder: And his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellour, the mighty God, the everlasting father, the Prince of peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David and upon his Kingdom to order it, and to stablish it with judgment and justice from henceforth even for ever. For that this passage is to be understood of the Messiah or Christ we have not only the testimony of an *Angel* <sup>1</sup> to warrant us, but the interpretation of the *Chaldee Paraphrast* who expressly interprets it of him. As indeed to whom else can those glorious Elogies be ascrib'd? Who but he, that was also the eternal Son of God, could have the title of the *Mighty God* and those other divine attributes that are ascribed to him? Though if neither the one nor the other of those testimonies, how pregnant soever, will satisfy an unbelieving Jew, we have yet to convince them the testimony of *Daniel*, <sup>1</sup> because to the name of the *Messiah* adding the title of *Prince*, and <sup>2</sup> so leaving no place for doubt concerning it. Now as after I have established by Scripture this first notion of the Messiah's anointing, there may be place for alledging the general opinion of the Jews, and that account which the Scriptures of the New Testament give us of it; So if we take the pains to consult them, we shall find this persuasion so deeply rooted in their minds, that when the Wise men from the East came to *Jerusalem* to enquire *where he was that was born King of the Jews*, *Herod* without any farther intimation of their minds, demanded of the High Priests and Scribes *where Christ was to be born*. But so also when *Nathaniel* had <sup>1</sup> been told by *Philip*, that they had found him of whom *Moses* and the *Prophets* did write, he came no sooner to be so perswaded of him, but he saluted him by the name of the *King of Israel*, as knowing that to be <sup>2</sup> an office to which the Messiah was design'd. Which latter argument is so much the more to be valued, because there was at that time nothing glorious upon our Saviours person, that we should think he should thereby be tempted to entertain so glorious an opinion of him. In fine, so perswaded were they of the Messiah's being a King, however they did not as yet think him to have enter'd upon it, that the two Sons of *Zebedee* before his Passion requested of him, <sup>3</sup> that the one of them might sit at his right hand, <sup>4</sup> and the other at his left; as all of them after his resurrection demand of him <sup>5</sup>, whether that were the time, in which he would restore the *Kingdom to Israel*.

But because this is a notion which the Jews are it may be too fond of already, but however not in controversy between them and us, therefore proceed we to enquire what appearance there is of our Saviours being so, and so corresponding in this particular with the promised Messiah. Where first of all I shall readily grant, or rather caution men that they do not think this Kingdom of our Saviour to have been an earthly one, or any way to the prejudice of those that are. For besides our Saviours so often styling it a *Kingdom of Heaven*, which he doth almost as often as he hath occasion to speak of it; Besides his refusing to bear himself so far as an Earthly Prince, as to take upon him to judge <sup>1</sup> in matters of estate; Beside lastly, his remitting men to the powers that then were as their only Masters in earthly matters, and commanding even his own Disciples <sup>2</sup> to <sup>3</sup> pay tribute to them; When he was particularly interrogated by *Pilate* concerning it, though he did not deny himself to be a King, yea moreover maintain'd himself to be so, yet he told him plainly enough that *his Kingdom was not of this world*, <sup>4</sup> nor by which therefore those that were <sup>5</sup>

— 38.

could be suppos'd to be prejudiced. Which so far satisfi'd *Pilate*, how earnestly soever the Jews press'd him with it, that he told them he could find <sup>b</sup> no fault in him, and that therefore, if they pleas'd, he would release him. He saw well enough, what the whole course of our Saviours life bore witness to, that he did not pretend to any jurisdiction of that nature, that he aim'd only to say that his Empire was rather over mens hearts than over their bodies or estates, and the consideration of that and of his own peaceable demeanour, made him acquit him in his own thoughts from any such pretences, and labour also the acquitting him before others. If he did not attain it, that was imputable to the Jews malice more than to the doctrine and practice of our Saviour or of those who followed after him in both: These however they might take upon them to oblige the world to obey his laws, yet representing him not at all as an earthly Prince, yea commanding men to obey those that were, and, if occasion were, to suffer also from them. And though the Jews of old, as those at this day likewise, have dream'd of another kind of Regalitie in the Messiah, and by which he should become an earthly Monarch, and they petty Princes under him; yet hath *Maimonides*, <sup>c</sup> though an assertour of the same dominion, told us, that *the Prophets and other excellent men desir'd to see the days of the Messiah, not so much for the plenty and jollity that should be in them, as for the society of good men, their honest conversation and knowledge, for the justice and excellent knowledge of the King himself, and the near relation he stood in to his Creatour; in fine, for that the whole law of Moses should then be perform'd without any unwillingness, perturbation, and coercion, according to that of the Prophet Jeremy, They shall teach no more every man his neighbour, &c. For they shall all know me from the least of them unto the greatest of them, and I will put my law in their hearts and take their stony hearts from them,* with many other Scriptures to the same purpose. Thus much, I say, *Maimonides*, though an Assertour of the Earthly Kingdom of the Messiah, hath yet confess'd concerning it; But *Rabbi Juda Leo*, yet more agreeably with the Christians notion of it, that *the whole business of the Messiah is spiritual and not corporal.* A thing which it is not hard for an attentive Reader to collect even from the Prophets themselves. For though many things in them are so express'd as might best suit with the understandings, or comply with the affections of that earthly and sensual people; yet are there several passages notwithstanding, which shew the Kingdom of the Messiah to contribute rather to the piety and eternal welfare, than the present interest of those that are subjects of it: Witness in particular that account which the Prophet *Jeremy* gives of the Covenant which God would make with his people in those days, the sum of which (as was but now noted out of *Maimonides*) was, that he would *write his law in their hearts, and remember their sins and iniquities no more.* And though we often read of the conquests of this great Prince, and of the triumphs he should obtain over the Heathen (which was in part verifi'd in the destruction of the Roman power which join'd with the Jews in the persecution of him) yet when we find from the same Scriptures that this great Prince was to be <sup>d</sup> the desire of all Nations, and that unto him <sup>e</sup> should the gathering of the people be; when we find it in like manner affirm'd, that they should <sup>f</sup> flow in unto him of their own accord, and as the Psalmist expresseth it, <sup>g</sup> he willing in the day of his power; <sup>h</sup> Jer. 23. 6. Lastly, when we find this great person stil'd the Lord our <sup>i</sup> righteousness, and

<sup>a</sup> Maimon. Praef. ad Perek Chelk apud Porti. Mosi, p. 160.

<sup>d</sup> Haggai 2. 7.

<sup>e</sup> Gen. 49. 10.

<sup>f</sup> Isa. 2. 2.

<sup>g</sup> Psa. 110. 3.

<sup>h</sup> Jer. 23. 6.



and read of the *abundance* of *righteousness* and peace that should be in his days, it is easy to collect, that the conquests he is elsewhere foretold to make should be principally over mens evil hearts, and over those powers that kept them in them. Jer. 33. 15, 16.

An account being thus given of the nature of our Saviours Kingdom, and withal what reason we have to believe the same to have been design'd by the Ancient Prophets; lest what hath been said concerning the spirituality thereof should make it thought to be none at all, proceed we to shew more particularly wherein the *Regalia* thereof consist. In the number whereof I reckon first, *his giving laws to his Church*, and obliging men under severe penalties to the obedience of them; this being a power which is inseparable from a Prince, and by the Scripture and Heathen Authors ever annexed to the Scepter. Now that this first ensign of Sovereignty was vested in our Saviour, is evident from that known Prophecy of *Jacob* concerning him, and from his own deportment and behaviour: from the former as appears from the Prophecy it self, but especially if we take in the *Septuagints* interpretation of the name *Shiloh*, than which the wisest of the Rabbins have not been able to find it a better. For the Scepter (saith that Prophecy) *shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his knees* ἡ δὲ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ δίκαιον *until he come to whom they do belong, and unto him shall the gathering of the people be*: That expression plainly intimating, that, when the Scepter and power of making laws should pass from *Judah*, they should be invested in the Messiah to whom they did of right appertain. Though setting that *Criticisme* aside, the thing it self is fairly deducible from those last words of the Prophecy; *And unto him shall the gathering or obedience of the people be*; The most easie and natural account that can be given of those words being, that, when *Judah* should lose its force and power, the Messiah should be enstated in it, and the people make their resort and pay their obedience unto him. This is most certain, and every where attested to by the Scriptures of the New Testament, that our Saviour bore himself as a Prince on this behalf, and prescrib'd Laws to the Subjects of his Kingdom; as that too, in such a stile as shew'd him to be the Author as well as the Promulger of them. For whereas the Prophets, that went before him, spake in such a language, as shew'd them to be but the publishers of anothers laws; they premising, *Thus* and *Thus saith the Lord*, to the several Precepts they inculcated; our Saviour on the contrary (as is evident from several passages of his Sermon upon the Mount) usher'd them in with *I say unto you*: Words which manifestly import the Authority of him from whom they came, and proclaim him to be a Lawgiver as well as a Prophet. A thing which is taken notice of by those that heard him, as may appear from the close of that discourse; *St. Matthew* there telling us, <sup>1</sup> *that the people were astonished at his doctrine because he taught them as one that had Authority and not as the Scribes.* Mat. 7. 28, 29 God (as the Psalmist speaks <sup>1</sup>) *had set this his King upon his holy hill*, and he accordingly publish'd laws from it, and miserable those people who shall not yield obedience to them, and acknowledge him to be their Lawgiver as well as their Saviour. Now though more than this be not necessary to shew, that our Saviour was invested with this Authority, he being to be look'd upon as a Lawgiver, whatever effect those his laws have, who both hath an Authority for it, and actually exerciseth it; yet because I have also said that this Authority was an Authority over the hearts of men, and Psal. 2. 6.

of which therefore it is but reasonable to believe we shall find no mean traces in their actions; therefore I think it but just to add that proof unto the former, and so much the rather, because the Old Testament speaks much of this obedience, and makes it, especially as exemplifi'd on the heathen world, a principal character of the Messiah's Kingdom. For not to tell you from the mouth of *Jacob*, because that was before insisted on, that *unto him should the gathering or obedience of the Gentiles be*, nor yet, because that also hath, that God should give him the heathen for his inheritance and the utmost part of the earth for his possession, which certainly they could not have been, unless they had in a great measure submitted to his Scepter; It is the Affirmation of the Prophet *Isay*, where he speaks of that *rod* which should arise out of the root of *Jesse*, and which is by the Chaldee Paraphrase it self interpreted of the Messiah, that it should stand <sup>m</sup> for an ensign to the people, and that to it should the Gentiles seek: As that too, not only to find a shelter under it, but (as the same Chaldee Paraphrase interprets it) to yield obedience to him, and fight under his Banner as well as to be protected by it; The effect of this ensign, and that rod being before describ'd to be an universal peace and righteousness, and such as should make those dwell securely together, who were before as contrary as the Wolf and Lamb, or the Leopard and young Lion to the Kid or Calf. Such evidence there is, from the Scriptures of the Old Testament, of his meeting with a general, obedience, who was design'd by God for the Messiah; but not less, yea far greater is the evidence we our selves have of his meeting with such an obedience, whom we own for our King and Messiah. For though the Kingdom of our Messiah began with a very small number, yea so small that it may seem not to have been unlike those of elder times, when every Master of a Family was also a Prince; yet hath it now a long time since diffus'd it self over the world, and been own'd and acknowledged by it: not indeed with the like sincerity by all, but by many with the most cordial acknowledgments, as by the major part of the rest with at least an outward obedience to it, and such as shew'd them not to have been without an approbation of his Authority, and the necessity of their own subjection to it. All which things are so much the more to be valued, because this Kingdom of our Saviour found the greatest part of the world addicted to other Masters, yea to those who had taken possession of their hearts, as well as of their lives and actions.

I will not say much, because I have elsewhere entreated of it though under another notion, concerning that part of our Saviours Sovereignty which consists in the pardoning of offenders. It may suffice here to observe, that, as it was foretold of the Messiah, that by his knowledge <sup>n</sup> he should justify many, and, though by a way unusual with earthly Princes, yet as truly and more effectually absolve them from their sins: So God, to fulfil that Prophecy both in us and him, exalted him to be a Prince <sup>o</sup> and a Saviour to give repentance to Israel and remission of sins. For though as a Saviour he was to save his people from their sins, yet, to enable him to become a Saviour, it was necessary he should first become a Prince, as to whom the power of saving as well as of condemning doth belong.

But neither shall I say much, because I have in a great measure prevented my self in that also, concerning that part of our Saviours Sovereignty which respects the Enemies of his Kingdom, and consists in an Authority

to chastise them, and power to put that Authority in execution. Only as the Messiah, by the Prophecies that went before concerning him, was both to meet with and triumph over temporal as well as Spiritual Enemies, the Psalmist affirming concerning those that he should break them with a rod of iron and dash them in pieces like a Potters Vessel: So our Saviour gave no small indication of this his power in the destruction of the Jewish Nation, which did both first of all and most vigorously oppose him. For beside that our Saviour affirms all power in heaven and earth to have been given him, and we therefore to look upon the destruction of that Nation as the result of his; Beside that both he and his Disciples attribute that destruction to his coming, and concerning which he may be rather be believ'd because he prophesied so distinctly and expressly concerning the destruction of their Temple and them: There were these two farther evidences of his interesting himself in the procuring of it; first, that all who were the obedient Subjects of this King, even the Christians, were before the beginning of the War forewarn'd from Heaven to remove from thence to Pella a Town beyond Jordan, by which means they escap'd those dangers; secondly, that that fatal Siege which put an end to their Temple, and City, and Nation, began at the very same time of the year when our Saviour was crucifi'd, and when there had flock'd three hundred thousand men out of all Judaea to keep the Pasover, and who by that means were all inclos'd in that fatal place: Both the one and the other of these being too pregnant proofs of his remembering their former impieties against himself and subjects, as well as of his care of those by whom he had been trusted in and obey'd. Which said, I will now go on to those other Offices to which our Saviour was anointed.

If the name of a King have been unacceptable to any, if the office and dignity of one hath been so much more, because prompting men to yield obedience to his laws or expect a severe usage from him; yet I hope that of a Priest, which I come now to entreat of, will find a more favourable entertainment, and consequently our discourse concerning it. For though it was also the duty of the Priest to teach the people theirs, according to that of the Prophet Malachy, for the Priests lips should preserve knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth; yet it is manifest from the books of Moses, and Gods appointing a distinct office for that purpose, that this was rather an Appendix to, than any proper part of their office. The office of a Priest consisted in many more acceptable employments, and such as were more grateful to the sinner. For whereas men by their impieties had provok'd the wrath of God, and consequently depriv'd themselves of his favour and blessing, God, to open a way to their reconciliation and future happiness, appointed Priests to *atone* and *mediate*. This, this was in short the office of a Priest both before and under the law, and therefore, if our Saviour was anointed to it, we may very well conclude him to have been anointed with the *oil of gladness* not only above his fellows, but even above himself in all other capacities.

For the evidencing whereof, and therewith that our Saviour was the promised Messiah, I will proceed in this method.

1. I will shew that that Messiah was to be a Priest.

2. That our Saviour was really such.

I. That the promised Messiah was to be a Priest, I prove from that passage of the Psalmist which is by the Author to the Hebrews brought

Psalm 110. 4.  
Heb. 5. 6.



<sup>7</sup> Annot. in Psa.  
110.

<sup>2</sup> Lib. 1. Part. 1.  
tit. Signum  
Octavum.

<sup>1</sup> Mat. 22. 45.

כה

<sup>2</sup> 2 Sam. 8. 18.  
comp. with  
1 Chro. 18.  
17. 2 Sam. 20.  
26.

<sup>c</sup> Gen. 14. 18,  
19.

to shew our Saviour to be such, *The Lord hath sworn and will not repent, Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek*; those words, as they are rendred by us, shewing him to be a Priest of whom they are affirm'd, and consequently that the Messiah was to be so, if he were the person meant. Only because it may be demanded what appearance there is of the Messiah's being intended, or if he were, whether the word we render *Priest* be rightly interpreted by us, I think it but just to establish each of these, and so remove all scruples concerning it. Now as it is apparent enough from the whole contexture of that Psalm, that one and the same person is understood in the verse that is now alledged out of it, and in that which gives beginning to it; so that the person spoken of *there* was no other than the Messiah is clear from the Jewish writers themselves. For thus *Rabbi Joden as Munster* tells us out of him <sup>y</sup>, *It shall come to pass that the holy and blessed God shall place Messiah the King at his right hand*, as it is written, *The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand untill I make thine enemies thy footstool*; As the Author of the book <sup>2</sup> published and animadverted upon by *Hulsw*, where he speaks of the Messiah *Ben David's* future contest with *Armillus* the supposed champion of the Christians, *God shall not any way force him to enter into it, but only say unto him. Sit thou at my right hand*, as it is in the place now quoted. And indeed, if the Jews would so far cease to be Jews as to lay aside their opposition to, and hatred of the Christians by whom this Psalm is appropriated to the Messiah, they might easily see enough in the Psalm itself to constrain them to the same understanding of it. For not to say, as our Saviour sometime argued, that this is manifestly to be understood of one who was to be the *Lord* <sup>a</sup> of *David*, and whom therefore it will be hard to find, unless they understand it of the Messiah; Whom can this Psalm better fit, or indeed at all, than the promised Messiah, and concerning whose great power and Kingdom so glorious things are every where foretold? The person here describ'd being one who was to *sit at the right hand of God*, to *rule in the midst of his enemies*, yea in the hearts of his own people, in fine *to strike thorough Kings in the day of his wrath, and wound the heads over many countries*. Which is such a description of the Messiah, even in their own apprehension of him, that a more accurate one cannot be found, nor any which doth more lively depict him. All therefore that will be necessary for us to shew is, that it is not without cause that we render the Hebrew word *Cohen* *Priest*, which the modern Jews, for fear they should gratifie the Christians in any thing, translate by the name of *Prince*. But beside that that is the most proper signification of the word, and so frequently us'd in the book of *Leviticus* where the Priestly office is describ'd; Beside that where it signifies *Prince* it denotes only those that were *inferior ones* <sup>b</sup>, and cannot therefore be well apply'd to so great a one as is here describ'd; It isto be observ'd farther, that he is said to be a *Cohen* or *Priest* after the order of *Melchizedek*, which takes away all pretence for any other understanding of it: *Melchizedek*, though a *Prince*, yet being also affirmed by *Moses* <sup>c</sup> and owned by themselves to have been a *Priest of the most high God*; yea affirmed to be a *Cohen* or *Priest* in the very same breath wherein he is represented as a *King*, and evidenced to be so by his blessing *Abraham* and receiving *tithes* from him. Whether the Jews will or no therefore, the Messiah was to be a *Priest*, and consequently nothing more

more incumbent upon us, than to shew our Saviour to have been such; which accordingly I come now to do.

2. Now there are two sorts of persons by whom the Priesthood of our Saviour is either infringed or denied, I mean the Socinians and the Jews. Against the former I alledge the Author to the *Hebrews* frequently applying to our Saviour the forementioned passage of the Psalmist, his styling him the *High Priest of our profession*, and a *High Priest who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens*. Against both, that proof he gave of his own being so in his *oblation, intercession, and blessing*, which comprehend within the compass of them all the actions of the Priestly Function.

Of the first of these being a part of the Priestly Function no doubt at all can be made by those, who have ever read the books of *Moses*, or the Author to the *Hebrews* reasoning where he endeavours to shew that Function to have been invested in our Saviour. For as it is evident that one<sup>d</sup> of the former of these is taken up in a great measure by prescribing rules to the Priests as to their offering of gifts and Sacrifices; so when the latter addresseth himself to shew our Saviour to have been a Priest, he tells us that *every high Priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sin*: As elsewhere with this farther addition<sup>e</sup>, *that therefore it was necessary that our Saviour should have somewhat to offer*. For every high priest (saith he) *is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices; wherefore it is of necessity that this man should have somewhat to offer*; plainly intimating both that that was a part of the Priestly office, and that it was also a part of our Saviours, which I come now more particularly to shew. Two things only it will be requisite for us to remove, because laid in our way by the *Socinians*, whereof the former is borrowed from *Hebrews* the *eighth* and the *fourth verse*, the latter from the *seventh chapter* and the *eleventh*. For inasmuch as it is not pretended that our Saviour made any other oblation than what he made of himself upon the Cross, if that were to be look'd upon as a real Sacrifice and such as denominated him a Priest, it would follow that our Saviour was a Priest when he was upon earth, because that oblation was made there; The contrary whereof seems yet expressly affirm'd in the place before alluded to. For if (saith that Apostle there speaking of our Saviour) *he were upon earth, he should not be a Priest, seeing that there are Priests that offer gifts according to the law*. For answer to which, nothing hath, or indeed can be said with greater reason, than what hath been by a *Reverend Prelate* of our own, to wit, that there is an *Ellipsis* in the words (as there is in several passages of *St. Paul's* writings) and ought to be supplied *thus*. For if he were on earth, he should not be a Priest *unless he had something to offer*. Which translation, or supplement rather, if it be to be allow'd, that argument will fall to the ground for our Saviour's not having been a Priest on earth; The meaning thereof being only this, that he could not be so much as an *Aaronical Priest* and one who served to the example and shadow of heavenly things (as the Apostle afterwards<sup>h</sup> speaks) *unless he had somewhat to offer*, and much<sup>i</sup> less such a High Priest, as the Scripture represents him. Now that after these words, *if he were on earth he should not be a priest*, we are to understand *unless he had something to offer*, will appear both from the foregoing and following words; from the foregoing, because the design<sup>of</sup>

<sup>d</sup> Leviticus.

<sup>e</sup> Heb. 5. 1.

<sup>f</sup> Heb. 8. 3.

<sup>g</sup> Mat. Eliensis  
Incepitio Bar  
Jesu.

<sup>h</sup> Heb. 8. 3.

of them is to shew, that it was necessary for our Saviour that *he should have somewhat to offer*; from the *latter*, because importing that *they* and they only are *Priests* (as the margent of our Bibles reads) *that offer gifts according to the law*, the offering of gifts being of the Essence of a Priest, and without which he could not be such. But neither is there any more force as to what is alledg'd from the same Epistle concerning Christ's being called *after the order of Melchizedek*, whom we do not find to have offered any thing, and *not after the order of Aaron* who did. As will appear if we consider each of these pretensions apart, and first of all that which respects *Melchizedek*. For how doth it appear first that *Melchizedek* did not offer sacrifices, nay what probability is there that he did not? Unless it may perhaps pass for such, that there is no mention of any sacrifices of his, any more than there is of the other passages of his life. But as that is in it self but a very weak proof, especially when it is not unknown that sacrifices were offered in those days; so his being stil'd a *Priest of the most high God* is a more probable proof that he did, than the bare omission of the mention of it is that he did not. I ask secondly, whether those, who do thus press us with the Priesthood of *Melchizedek*, will aver that Priesthood of his to be wholly different from the order of *Aaron*, or only in some particulars? If they say the former, they expressly contradict the Scripture, which attributes the power of *Blessing* unto them both; it being no less true of *Aaron*, than it was of *Melchizedek*, that he was separated to *blest* in God's name. On the other side, if they say that they differ'd only in some particulars, they say enough to ruine their own pretensions; because then it will be incumbent upon them to shew, or else they shew nothing, that they differ'd as to the matter of *sacrificing* or *not sacrificing*, which I shall then only believe when I see done. And indeed, as the Author to the *Hebrews* hath not given us the least occasion to think that the Priesthood of *Aaron* and *Melchizedek* differ'd as to this particular; so he hath instanc'd in things enough to shew that there is a sufficient difference between them, without calling in this to help it out; such as are their appertaining to *different States* or *Oeconomies*, being *inaugurated into after different manners*, of *different durations*, and *belonging to persons of different qualifications*. Which as they are enough to constitute that difference which is pretended by our adversaries to be between them, so being the only things instanc'd in by the Author to the *Hebrews*, his words are not to be farther extended, and much less to exclude the business of sacrificing from having any part in one of them. As little am I mov'd with what is press'd with as much clamour, that our Saviour was not call'd after the order of *Aaron*. For as no man that I know of affirms that he was, or is under any necessity of so doing, there being differences enough between Christ's Priesthood and that of *Aaron* without denying him to have offer'd a true and proper Sacrifice; As moreover it is evident from the Text but now insisted on, that whatsoever difference there was between them yet they agreed in the offering of a Sacrifice, the Author to the *Hebrews* inferring from the Aaronical high Priest's offering sacrifices that *it was of necessity* that our Saviour *should have somewhat to offer* also: So one main difference between the two Priesthoods was, that, whereas the one had for the matter of its sacrifices *Bulls* and *Goats*, the other had for its the *body of the Priest* himself, as is clear from these following words of



of the same Apostle<sup>1</sup>. Wherefore when he cometh into the world he saith, <sup>1</sup> Heb. 10. 5. &c. *Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me. In burnt-offering and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will O God.* For as the same Apostle presently after adds, that when he prescribed burnt-offerings and sacrifices, he meant <sup>1</sup> Heb. 10. 8. only such as were offered by the law; so he doth therefore more than intimate, when he brings in our Saviour adding *but a body hast thou prepared me*, that that body of his was to be the matter of his sacrifice, as well as the instrument of accomplishing God's will. Of which yet if there be any doubt, the following words<sup>1</sup> will clear it, because not only <sup>1</sup> Heb. 10. 11. affirming *that will* which he came to do to be the *sanctification of us through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all*, but that whereas other Priests stand daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sin, this Man or this Priest rather (for the word Man is not in the Greek) after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever sat down on the right hand of God. The only question that can be made in this particular is, whether the offering of the body of Christ before spoken of were his offering it upon the Cross, or the presenting thereof afterwards to his Father in Heaven. But beside that the former is the most usual Notion of the word offering, and consequently not easily to be departed from; The offering before spoken of is said to have been made *once for all*: Which, as it is a known Epithete of our Saviour's death, St. Paul telling us in his Epistle to the Romans<sup>m</sup>, that *in that he died he died unto sin once, or once for all* (for the same word *ipinaξ* is in the original Greek) so cannot that be well affirm'd of the presenting of his body and merits in Heaven in order to the good of particular mens Souls: It being certain that this he every day doth, because every day so interceding for them. And though I know it be also affirm'd, which may seem to be some prejudice to this inference, that *Christ entered once for all into the holy place by his own blood*, yet is it not in like manner affirm'd, that he made an offering of himself there once for all, neither can it by any just consequence be deduced from it; His *entring in once for all* implying only that he should not need to enter in a second time, or go over the same uneasy steps he had gone before. Which what cognation hath it with the making *once for all* an oblation of himself, which is the only thing in question between us? It would be considered secondly, that the offering of our Saviour before spoken of is there compar'd with the sacrifices of every Priest, yea with such as they offer'd daily. For every Priest, saith that Apostle, *standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sin*. But this Man, or this Priest rather, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins sat down on the right hand of God. For supposing nothing else meant by this offering of our Saviour, than his presenting himself in Heaven, what Analogy could there be between their offerings and his? the blood of the daily sacrifices being never brought into the holy place, and consequently having nothing in them to answer our Saviour's presenting himself in Heaven. Lastly, supposing that by the offering before spoken of were meant our Saviour's presenting himself in Heaven, as the High Priest presented himself in the Holy of Holies; yet will not that destroy but rather confirm his former Sacrifice upon the Cross: Because the High Priest, to whom

whom he is compar'd, could not enter into the Holy of Holies, till he had made another kind of offering.

But because we have not only to do with Socinians but with Jews, who, whatever the other may be, will not be apaid with affirmations of Scripture, unless we can also shew those affirmations to be consonant to reason, and the received doctrine concerning Priests and Sacrifices; therefore to make it yet more evident that our Saviour was a Priest, we will reflect upon the *Oblation* which he is said to have made of himself upon the Cross, the *Manner of the oblation* of it, and *the End*.

And here in the first place it is not to be denied, that the *matter* of this Sacrifice differ'd much from that of *Aaron* and other Priests, even by the confession yea glory of those who pretend to partake of it; this being not the carcass of Bulls and Goats, but the Body of a Man, yea of one who did pretend also to be the Son of God. But as its being the Body of a Man doth not hinder it from being the matter of a Sacrifice, as Gods commanding *Abraham* and his readiness to offer up *Isaac* shews; so that, and the worth of the person whose it was, to those who duly consider it, will make it the more meet to be so: Because so much the more likely, by reason of its worth, to appease the anger of him to whom it is pretended to be offered. And therefore though the thing it self be not to be justified, because they, who did it, had no warrant at all for it; yet was it not without all reason that many of the Heathen pass'd from the sacrificing of Beasts to that of Men, yea to that of their own *Children* and the *flower of their Nobility*: They rightly judging, that the more noble the sacrifices were, so much the more likely were they to atone their Deities; because both coming nearer to a satisfaction to them, and a greater instance of their remorse for those sins by which they had provok'd them. Which *last* particular, though it was wanting in this of ours, because offered rather for us than by us; yet, as I shall afterwards shew, is abundantly supply'd by the great dignity of the sacrifice it self, and the acceptation of him to whom it was offer'd.

But neither is it to be deny'd, if we have a regard to the *manner of its oblation*, but that there was yet a more notable difference between this sacrifice of our Priest's, and those which were offered by others: Because this sacrifice was offered up, not by the hands of the Priest himself, but by those of wicked and ungodly men; and who therefore may seem to have been more the *Priests* than he, or rather, because murderers of him, to have committed a *flagitious act*, and not so much *sacrific'd* as *butcher'd* him. And indeed if our Saviour had been meerly passive in this affair, yea had not had a more than ordinary influence in the offering his own body, neither could this death of his have been look'd upon as a sacrifice, nor he as a Priest for the offering it up. But as *Origen* sometime answer'd *Celsus*, who reproach'd our Saviour with being taken by his enemies, that if by being taken he meant an *involuntary* one, our Saviour was not taken; because (as he afterwards reasons) he did not only *not hinder himself from being taken*, but *went out of his own accord to meet those who came to do it*, and both once and again told them that he was the person they came to seek. So if by offering him up by the hands of wicked and ungodly men, he meant the offering him up against or without his own will, he was not at all offered up by them, nay they did in truth contribute no more to it than the knife or other instruments of Sacrifice do so the offering up of that Sacrifice which they slay;

† Contra Cels.  
lib. 2. pag. 64.  
'Αλλ' ἐπειρήσει  
αὐτὸν ὅτι ἐλάω,  
ἀπομείνῃ ὅτι  
οἱ περ τὸ ἐλάω  
καὶ ἀκρόσιν  
ἔχον, ἐχέλω  
δ' Ἰησοῦς.

slay; Because (as our Saviour told them before this oblation of his) *no man did or could take away his life from him*; If that were to be done, it was to be by his own *laying it down*, as in whom the power of it was vested. Which as it shews the death of Christ to be a proper sacrifice, as to any thing which can be alledg'd from the Jews procuring it (for why might not our Priest offer himself up by the hands of wicked men, as well as by a knife or a fire?) so both leaves the offering it up in his hands to whom we ascribe it, and shews him to have been a Priest for doing it. But so, that I may not press the Jews with any thing which hath not the attestation of their own Scriptures, did their Psalmist as well as ours long since foretel concerning him. For after he had brought in God insinuating that he did not *desire the usual sacrifices*, but rather that the Messiah would sacrifice *that body which he had prepared for him*; he brings in that Messiah as readily answering *Lo I come to do thy will O God*. even that will (as our Apostle speaks) which imported the attoning of him, as well as the sanctifying of us *by the offering of his body once for all*: Which shews the offering here spoken of not to have been extorted from him by the malice of his enemies, but freely and readily tendered by himself. I know not whether I should add, because that was none of the laws of a Sacrifice, however look'd upon by some men as a lucky attendant of it. But if they did not judge amiss, who esteem'd it for a good omen if the beast that was to be sacrificed came without any reluctancy to the Altar, we may promise our selves no small acceptance by the ready submission of him, who was made a Sacrifice to God for us: Because, whatever the readines of other sacrifices were, the voluntariness of ours cannot but be look'd upon as a virtue, as being no other than of the person that offer'd it.

I am not a little tempted by the false glosses of the Socinians, both to shew that one great end of sacrifices was to *make reconciliation for sin*, and that this was the professed aim of that which our High Priest offered up to God for us. But because the Jews, with whom we have principally to do in this Article, acknowledge the truth of the first of these, and the latter hath been more than once reserv'd for another place, it shall suffice me briefly to observe, that, as it was foretold concerning the Messiah that *his soul should be made an offering for sin*, and so that by the *knowledge thereof* we should be *justified* from it; so it is affirm'd concerning ours, that, whereas other Priests stand *daily ministring and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices which can never of themselves take away sin*, or at least not as to the eternal guilt of it, this *Man*, or this *Priest* rather offered *one sacrifice* for it, and such as did infallibly remove the guilt of it: Not only the opposition between this and the other sacrifices requiring our so understanding of it, but the Apostles immediately after affirming, that by that *one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified*, yea so, that *their sins and iniquities should not be any more remembred*, than the pollution of them should be suffered to stay upon their minds. For otherwise, neither would that passage of the Prophet *Jeremy* have serv'd for a witness of that *perfection* which he attributes to it; and much less would it have been proper for the Apostle to close up all with *Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin*: This plainly intimating *remission of sin* to have been a part of that perfection, yea such a remission as left no place for any future offering.



A due establishment being thus given to the first act of our Saviour's Priesthood, and wherein indeed the only difficulty lies, I will not stand long to shew that those of *intercession* and  *blessing* are equally compe-  
 tible to him. For as it is too well known from the Scripture to be in-  
 sisted on here, that it was a part of the Priestly Function to intercede  
 for the people; so we have not only frequent instances of the like inter-  
 ceptions of our Saviour in the New Testament, but an assurance from  
 the Author to the *Hebrews*, that whereas other Priests *were not suffered to*  
*continue by reason of death*, and so could no more always intercede for  
 men than they could always offer for sin, this *Man* or this *Priest* rather  
 had a *continued Priesthood* as well as *being*, by living ever to make in-  
 tercession for us. And though where the Psalmist takes notice of the  
 promised Messiah's being a Priest, he doth not make any exprefs mentio-  
 n of his shewing himself a Priest as to this particular, yet doth he not  
 obscurely insinuate it by affirming him <sup>x</sup> to be a *Priest for ever*: It being  
 not to be thought, especially when it is there also foretold that he should  
 be *lifted up* and *rule* and *judge*, that he should be always offering up  
 himself, and consequently, that he should shew himself to be a Priest by  
 always *interceding* for us and  *blessing* us. Again, whereas it belong'd  
 both to the Melchizedekian and Aaronical Priest to *bles*s, as well as *in-*  
<sup>y</sup> *tercede*, the former being affirm'd to have blessed <sup>y</sup> *Abraham*, as the lat-  
<sup>z</sup> *ter* directed to bles those Israelites <sup>z</sup> that were under his respective charge;  
 Whereas the Priestly blessing, as we understand from that of *Aaron*, was  
 a blessing with effect, because though in it self but a simple prayer to  
 God for one, was yet such as was promised both <sup>a</sup> to be heard and an-  
<sup>a</sup> *swer'd* by him: We have an assurance from the New Testament, not only  
 of our Saviours so far blessing his people as to pray for them, and pro-  
 cure them those blessings for which he pray'd, but (which is a blessing  
 that no Priest did ever before pretend to) even conferring spiritual bles-  
 sings on them. For thus for the former of these we are not only told,  
<sup>b</sup> *that he would pray the father, and he should give them another com-*  
*forter that should abide with them for ever*, but assur'd both from sto-  
 ry and experience that God hath made good that blessing of our Sa-  
 viour's by conferring from time to time the graces of his spirit on them.  
 In like manner, though other Priests could go no farther than such a  
 blessing, as beg'd, though with effect, the blessing of the Almighty; Yet  
 we understand from the Scripture that Christ did yet more *signally* bles  
 his people, because conferring upon them those blessings for which he  
 pray'd: St. *Peter* affirming in one place <sup>c</sup> that it was he *who shed forth*  
<sup>d</sup> *that Holy Ghost* that was conferr'd upon them, as elsewhere <sup>d</sup> that *God*  
*having raised up his son Jesus, sent him to bles us in turning away e-*  
*very one of us from our iniquities.*

Now though I cannot say as yet, as *Andrew* said to his Brother *Si-*  
<sup>e</sup> *mon* <sup>e</sup>, *we have found the Messiah which is being interpreted the Christ*,  
 yet thus much I may, that I have already discover'd him who, beside o-  
 ther characters of the Messiah, had the anointing both of *King* and *Priest*;  
 It remains, to compleat our *inquiry*, that we find him to have been a *Pro-*  
*phet*, which was the third Function to which this ceremony of anoint-  
 ing did of old consign men. For though this office of the Messiah be  
 not so easily to be discern'd in the Old Testament, and much less in the  
 writings of the Jews; yet that it was not without sufficient ground in the  
 former, that one passage of the Prophet *Moses* <sup>f</sup>, which is by St. *Peter* <sup>g</sup> ap-  
 ply'd

<sup>x</sup> Psal. 110. 4.

<sup>y</sup> Gen. 14. 19.

<sup>z</sup> Num. 6. 23.

<sup>a</sup> Num. 6. 27.

<sup>b</sup> Joh. 14. 16.

<sup>c</sup> Act. 2. 33.

<sup>d</sup> Act. 3. 26.

<sup>e</sup> Joh. 1. 41.

<sup>f</sup> Deut. 18. 15.

<sup>g</sup> Act. 3. 22.

ply'd to our Saviour, may serve for an abundant evidence. *The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thy brethren like unto me, unto him shall ye hearken.* Only because the Jews either understand this of a succession of Prophets, or apply it to some other than the Messiah, I think it, but reasonable to enquire, into the legitimacy of their pretensions, before I come to assert it to him to whom it is supposed to belong.

As the Jews are not alone in understanding a succession of Prophets to have been at least connoted in the words (for so we shall find even Christian Expolitors to have understood them and particularly *Paulus Fagius* and *Grotius*) so that that interpretation of theirs is not without ground, the connexion of them with the foregoing words shew. For the design of the foregoing ones being to caution them against the superstitious *Diviners* of the Heathen, and particularly of those heathens among whom they were now to come, because to enter upon their lands; it may seem but reasonable to infer, especially when that follows immediately upon it, that when *Moses* told them of Gods raising up to them, a much better Prophet out of their own selves, his meaning was to say, that what they sought to those Diviners, for should both more easily and more innocently be had among their own selves: Gods intention being from time to time to raise them up such Prophets, as should furnish them with the notice of those things which they resorted to Diviners for. For as when the mention of Gods raising up a Prophet is immediately subjoin'd to the condemnation of those Prophets of the Devil, we cannot well understand it to have had a more plausible ground, than to keep them back from running after the other; So can we not therefore well understand God and his servant *Moses*, but that he would send them many such, and who should from time to time supply both the Southsayers place and *Moses*: The raising up one single Prophet, as that too at such a distance from them, being not likely to secure them in the mean time from running after or listning to the other. Now forasmuch as this promise of the Prophet was intended to keep them from running after false ones, as by the connexion of this verse to the precedent may appear; forasmuch as there was continual danger of their running after Diviners, as having seen too many of them in the land of *Egypt*, and being now to see more of them in *Canaan*, but however such cases would often fall out in which they might desire a resolution: therefore to prevent one and satisfy the other he must needs be suppos'd to have promis'd a constant succession of Prophets whom they might consult as occasion requir'd. And indeed as on the one hand considering the proneness of humane nature to enquire into things secret, and the pretences of the Heathen Diviners to satisfy those that resorted to them therein, it had been little less than impossible <sup>b</sup> to have held the Jews in obedience to God if he had not gratified them something in this particular; So on the other hand we find the Prophets of the true God descend to satisfy them in such things as they were wont to consult Southsayers about. For thus *Samuel* satisfied *Saul* concerning the asses his father had lost, and about which he came to consult him. And so also the Prophet *Ahijah* did the Wife of *Jeroboam* \* concerning that sick child about which she came to enquire, he telling her that *as soon as she enter'd into the City, the child of whom she consulted him should die*. But so also when *Abaziah* sent to enquire of *Baalzebub* whether he should recover of his disease, the Prophet *Elijah*, by the command of God, demanded

<sup>a</sup> Vid. Origen. cont. Cels. li. i. p. 28, & 29. Ut & Mai. mon. Praefat. in Seder Zeraim apud Port. Moiss, pag. 20. <sup>b</sup> 1 Sam. 9. 26. <sup>c</sup> 1 Kings 14. 12.

<sup>1</sup> 2 Kings 1. 3. of his messengers whether it were not <sup>1</sup> *because there was not a God in Israel*, that they went to enquire of the *God of Ekron*. Which shews that the God of *Israel* descended to satisfy such enquiries, and that they might have a resolution of them from his Prophets.

But beside the promise of a succession of Prophets, the better to take them off from following Diviners, the words of the prophecy do also point out some principal one whom God should raise up unto that Nation; as is evident not only from the Texts speaking in the singular number, but from the description that is given of him. For inasmuch as there was a vast difference between the generality of the Prophets and *Mose*, as is evident both from their stories and the last chapter of the book of *Deuteronomy* <sup>m</sup>, the Scripture there telling us that *there arose not any more a Prophet like unto Moses whom God knew face to face*, it will follow, because the Prophet here spoken of is promised to be like him, that some principal one is *withal* meant, and one who should rival him in his excellencies. Which is so apparent, that though the Jews have oppos'd the applying this place to our Saviour, as *Paulus Fagius* tells us from their writings, yet do several of themselves acknowledge it to be meant of a single person and particularly of *Joshua* or *Jeremiah*. Though with how little reason that also is suggested, will appear if these two things be considered. 1. That the *miracles* they wrought were not equal to those of *Moses*, as, 2. That they did not *see God face to face* for ought appears from the Scripture, or from what the Jews themselves have affirm'd concerning them. So necessary a thing is it to understand the prophecy we speak of both of a single person and the Messiah, as in other than whom neither they nor we can find it to have been punctually fulfill'd; and if so, nothing will remain for us to do, but to shew our Saviour to have been such, that is to say, a Prophet, and such a one as is there describ'd, only because neither the one nor other of those can well be demonstrated, till it do first appear *what it is* to be a Prophet, I think it but just to premise somewhat concerning the notion of a Prophet, which will be found to stand in these three things.

1. That he reveal Gods will unto the world.
2. That he understand that will from God himself.
3. That he make that appear to other men.

1. There are who have thought, from the bare signification of the word *Prophet* or at least as that is commonly understood, that the office of a Prophet was only to *foretel things to come* through the influence of a Divine Spirit. But beside that the Hebrew names <sup>n</sup>, by which a Prophet is denoted, import no such foretelling as they imagine; Beside that the Prophets gave answers concerning things *past* as well as *future*, as is evident from the forementioned instance of the *Asses of Saul* and the *Samaritan* womans collecting our Saviour to be a Prophet from his having told her <sup>o</sup> *whatsoever* she had done; Beside lastly, that their predictions may seem rather to have been the mark by which they were to be known, than the employment for which they were intended: They who shall look into the writings of those Prophets, whose memories have been transmitted to us, will find their chief business to have been to make known God's will to mankind, and particularly that will of his which is to be done by our selves. Thus to instance in *Moses*, because confessedly a great Prophet, yea if we may believe the Jews <sup>p</sup> *the father of all those Prophets that went before or followed him*; Who is there that

<sup>n</sup> מוֹדֵי־בְּרִיָּה *Videns.*  
נְבִיאָה *Præco.*  
rator.  
<sup>o</sup> מוֹדֵי־בְּרִיָּה *Videns.*

<sup>p</sup> Joh. 4. 19, 29.

<sup>r</sup> Maimon.  
Præf. ad Pereq  
Chelek apud  
Port. Mosi,  
p. 169.



that sees not his Predictions to be the least part of his writings; yea to be as nothing in comparison of the predictions of other Prophets, or his own declarations of Gods commands? Which shews that either these latter were the principal business of a Prophet, or that *Moses* was not so faithful in the discharge of it, as he is commonly pretended to be. But why instance I in *Moses*, as if he only thus shewed himself to be a Prophet, when it is evident from the mouth of God, that this was the principal errand of them all? It being from himself that we understand that he sent unto the Israelites <sup>1</sup> the Prophets to prompt them to return from their <sup>2</sup> *Jer. 35. 15* evil ways, and amend their doings, and not go after other Gods to serve them. From all which as it doth appear, that the proper business of a Prophet is to reveal Gods will unto the world, so I have insisted the rather on it, to establish the true notion of one, and thereby evince our Saviour to have been such. For though he was not without his Predictions, yet his Prophetical office chiefly appear'd in the Declarations of Gods will concerning the lives and conversations of his Disciples.

2. From the revelation of Gods will pass we to the Prophets understanding it from God himself, which is, if I may so speak, the very formality of a Prophet. For as it is the language of the *New Testament* that *Prophecy came not in old time by the will of man*, but holy men of God <sup>1</sup> *2 Pet. 1. 21* spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; So the Pen-men thereof learnt it from *Moses*, yea from that God by whom they were inspir'd; he himself affirming <sup>2</sup> *Numb. 12. 8* that if there were a Prophet among them, he the Lord would make himself known unto them in a vision and speak unto them in a dream. This he would do to the meanest of his Prophets, he would be the insufer of his own Oracles. And hence so frequently in the Prophets, that of *The word of the Lord came unto me*, and particularly in the Prophet *Ezekiel*; Hence also their faulting those who prophesied <sup>3</sup> *Eze. 13. 17* out of their own hearts, those who <sup>4</sup> *Jer. 23. 21* ran when God sent them not, and <sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* prophesied though God spake not unto them. All which expressions shew plainly, that as it was Gods will the Prophet was to reveal, so he was to understand it from himself. And though (as was before intimated) the word *προφητεια* in the *Greek* may seem strictly and literally to import one who foretells things to come; Yet *Grammarians* have observ'd, <sup>6</sup> *Vid. Hammond Annot. in Luc. 2. m.* that the word signifies no more than the speaking from or instead of another, and consequently, when appli'd to divine Messengers, the speaking from that God whose Prophets they pretended to be.

3. The only thing to be accounted for in the notion of a Prophet is, that he make it appear to the world that he is really such, and that, as he doth pretend to speak by inspiration from God, so he evidence himself to do so. For though the Vision, wherein God appear'd to him, may be enough to satisfy himself concerning his own call, yet can it not be of any force to those who are to be acquainted with it, and much less so far as to oblige men to the admission of it: These, as they are not able to discern what is transacted within anothers Soul, so being not to be assured of it but by a like Vision from the Almighty, or by some outward notes or marks. The former whereof as it were a fond thing to expect, because God might with the same ease make us all Prophets, so there is therefore a necessity of concluding, that they, who pretend to be so, ought to evidence their inspirations by such notes as are investigable by our senses. Thus, I say, the natural reasonings of our minds prompt us to argue; neither find we any thing in *revelation* to thwart us in it. On the contrary,

R

even

even where it proposeth the listning to that great Prophet whereof we  
<sup>Deut. 18. 21.</sup> speak, it both allows us <sup>2</sup> to enquire how we shall come to know a true  
 Prophet from a pretended one, and proposeth for the doing of it the fall-  
<sup>Deut. 13. 1.</sup> ing or not falling out of that which they foretel, as *elsewhere* <sup>2</sup> the doing  
 or not doing of a miracle. Always provided, that they did not draw  
<sup>Deut. 13. 3-4.</sup> men off to other Gods <sup>b</sup>, or prompted them to disobey or despise him. In  
 fine so reasonable did God deem it to be for a Prophet to evidence his  
<sup>Exo. 4.</sup> own mission, that when he sent *Moses* unto *Pharaoh* <sup>c</sup>, he furnished him  
 with a power to work miracles, and oblig'd him, if *Pharaoh* demanded  
 such a one, to shew it.

It appearing from the premises what is included in the notion of a Pro-  
 phet, little need to be said to shew our Saviour to have been such. If we  
 enquire concerning that which we have said to be the chief business of a  
 Prophet, the whole Gospel is our witness of our Saviours manifesting  
 himself to be one, because a witness of his declaration of the will of God  
 to the world, as well that which he obliged us to perform, as what he  
 gave us reason to expect. If we enquire concerning the same Jesus under-  
 standing that will of God from God himself, of his understanding it not  
 from man, but from the immediate inspirations of Gods Spirit; the same  
<sup>Mat. 3. 16.</sup> Gospel assures us of the *Holy Ghosts descending* <sup>d</sup> upon him in a bodily  
<sup>Col. 2. 9.</sup> shape, yea that the *Godhead dwelt in him* <sup>e</sup> bodily. Lastly, if concerning  
 his confirming his call and doctrine by miraculous works; this also is as  
 notorious, as being not only attested to by the Declarations of the Scripture,  
 but by the constant belief of his Church, and the readiness of many of its mem-  
 bers to lay down their lives to bear witness both to them and to his doctrine.

But here a question may not unseasonably be interpos'd, especially con-  
 sidering that we have now to do with Jews, whether our Saviours going  
 about to *destroy their ancient form of worship* do not detract Faith from  
 his Miracles, or whatever other evidences we pretend his Prophetical Of-  
 fice to have been confirmed by. For as it is one fundamental Article of  
 the Faith of the modern Jews, that the law of *Moses* <sup>f</sup> shall never be abo-  
 lished, or changed, nor any beside that proceed from the Creatour; As  
 neither, that any thing shall be superadded to, or taken from it, whe-  
 ther in the Scripture or the explication of it, according as it is said,  
<sup>Maimon. Praef. ad Perec Chelek seu Cap. decimum Tractat. Sanhedr. fundam. 9. apud Port. Moiss. pag. 175.</sup> *Thou shalt not add to, or diminish from it*: So God himself may seem  
 to have commanded them to slight such Prophets as attempted it, though  
<sup>Deut. 13. 1. &c.</sup> the sign or wonder came to pass. For if (saith he <sup>g</sup>) there arise among  
 you a Prophet or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a won-  
 der, and the sign or the wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto thee  
 saying, Let us go and serve other Gods which thou hast not known, and  
 let us serve them. Thou shalt not hearken to the words of that Prophet,  
 or that dreamer of dreams. For the Lord your God proveth you, to  
 know whether you love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with  
 all your soul. Ye shall walk after the Lord your God, and fear him, and  
 keep his commandments, &c. And accordingly a Jew in his Book call'd  
*Nizaon* doth thus argue against our Saviours being that Prophet whom  
 in the Text before alledged we are commanded to hear. For *Jesuw* (saith  
<sup>Vid. Paul. Fag. in Deut. 18. 15.</sup> he) did not only affirm himself to be a Prophet <sup>h</sup>, but also made him-  
 self a God, and seduc'd his brethren. Therefore *Moses* said of him, Thou  
 shalt not acquiesce in him, nor hearken unto him, but shalt surely kill  
 him, which accordingly they did and hanged him.

In answer to which we are first to know, that the principal thing cau-  
 tion'd

tion'd against in the foremention'd Text was their falling off to *Idolatry*, or the *worship of other Gods*; which if any Prophet went about to tempt them to, they were by no means to listen to him, though he confirm'd his doctrine by a miracle. And but reason, that God having confirm'd his own *being* and *Godhead* by so many, he should forbid them to listen to any who should go about to overthrow it, though he should give some kind of proof of a divine mission. I say secondly, that supposing it to have been the design of the Almighty, as the *fourth* verse of that *chapter* seems to insinuate, that they should not listen to any Prophet, though he should give them a sign; if he went about to make any change in that law which God had establish'd among them; yet ought that to be understood; *principally* at least, of that part of the law which was *moral*, and by consequence of eternal obligation. Which as our Saviour never went about to destroy, but rather to confirm and fulfil, so if he had, he ought no doubt to have been rejected, what miracles soever he had shewn: *The testimony of the understanding* (as *Maimonides*<sup>i</sup> well observes) *which convinceth the profession of any Prophet of falsity, being more firm than the testimony of the eye which hath seen his miracles*; because that is a direct and immediate rule of truth and fallhood, of which the other is only an indirect one, and (as I may so speak) at second hand. And truly, considering *on the one hand* Gods instancing in such pretended Prophets as drew them off to other Gods, and *on the other* the alterations which those, who were confessedly Prophets, made in the Ceremonial law (*Elijah* offering Sacrifice<sup>k</sup> in Mount *Carmel* contrary to that law which restrain'd<sup>l</sup> burnt-offerings to *Jerusalem*, and *Elisha* commanding<sup>m</sup> the Israelites in their laying waste of the Moabitish Cities to fell down every fair tree without exception contrary to another<sup>n</sup>; both which instances are remembered by *Maimonides*<sup>o</sup>; with this sentence of the Wisemen in the *Talmud*, *In all things if the Prophet say unto thee Transgress the words of the Law, hearken unto him except in the case of Idolatry*. These things I say consider'd, it cannot but be thought to have been the design of God in the place we are now upon to caution them, *chiefly if not only* against listening to such Prophets who went about to overthrow the more substantial parts of the law, which it is certain our Prophet did not. But let us suppose yet thirdly, that it was the design of the Almighty to damn such Prophets as should attempt a change in any part of their law, or at least, as *Maimonides* before remarks, for *perpetuity*; Yet must that be understood with this limitation, unless it were such changes as God himself foretold should be, and, which is more, promised to effect. For otherwise we should detract Faith not from a pretended Prophet, but from God and undoubted ones. Now that change which our Saviour made in the Law, was no other than what God himself had foretold he would sometime effect, as is evident from Jer. 31. 31. *For behold the days come (saith the Lord) that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah. Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband to them saith the Lord. But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel. After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my people.* From which words it is evident, that God intended to enter into a new Covenant with them, and establish a new form of worship, that is to say, a spiritual one. Now

<sup>i</sup> Prafat. in Se-  
der Zeraim a-  
pud Pocock  
Port. Mosi, p.

<sup>14</sup>

<sup>k</sup> 1 Kings 18.

<sup>l</sup> Deut. 12. 13,

<sup>14</sup>

<sup>m</sup> 2 Kings 3.

<sup>19</sup>

<sup>n</sup> Deut. 20. 19;

<sup>o</sup> Maimon. lo-  
co citato p. 27:



though it be true that this Prophecy of *Jeremy* is postnate to that law which forbade the listening to any Prophets which should go about to overthrow it; yet beside that the Prophecy is own'd by the Jews as well as us, and moreover penn'd by one, who, though he foretold such a change, yet did not endeavour it himself; the very same Covenant, though more obscurely, was foretold long before the law; even by those Prophecies which foretold the coming in of all Nations to this Messiah<sup>p</sup>, or, as the Prophet *Habacuc* afterwards<sup>q</sup> expressed it, *the whole earth's being filled with the knowledge of the Lord*. For as the religion of the Jews was in a manner peculiar to that Country and people, and set up as a kind of Partition Wall between them and the rest of the world; so it could not be exercis'd in due form but in the land of *Judea*, in which as it were a vain thing ever to hope all the world should be compris'd, so no less that they could resort to it. Now forasmuch as by the force of those Prophecies there was to be a Religion in the days of the Messiah different from that of the Jews; forasmuch as those Prophecies were in being before the giving of the law; it follows, that that Precept thereof, concerning not listening to any Prophet who should go about to introduce a new, could not prejudice the introducing of this, because so long before that of the law foretold and promised. Of as little force as to this purpose is it, how peremptorily soever insisted on by *Maimonides*<sup>r</sup>, and the generality of the Jewish Writers, that *Malachi*<sup>s</sup> the last of the Old Prophets cautions the Jews to *remember the law of Moses*, as if on purpose to obviate the pretences of any that should go about to abolish it; The utmost extent of that *Memento* being but till the coming of *Elias*, as the following verse shews, and consequently no way hindring its receiving a period by the Messiah of whom this *Elias* was to be a forerunner. So that the only thing to be accounted for toward the evidencing our Saviour to be a Prophet, is that which is objected by the Author of the Book call'd *Nizaon*, even his *making himself a God*; which may seem to put him in the number of those Prophets, who tempted them *to go after other Gods*, and who therefore were not to be believ'd, though they should give a sign or a wonder. But beside that our Saviour did not draw his Disciples from the *God of Israel*, but on the contrary honour'd him himself, and oblig'd others to do it; In calling upon them to honour *himself* he did not call upon them to serve *other Gods*, and *such as they had not known*: Not to serve *other Gods* because *one in essence with him whom the Jews own'd for theirs*; not such a God *as they had not known*, because as their Chaldee Paraphrase doth frequently make mention of the *Word* as distinct from the person of the *Father*, so the notion of the Messiah's being God hath a sufficient foundation in their own Scriptures, as I have heretofore<sup>t</sup> in part evidenc'd, and shall by and by more fully, when I come to prove him to be *God's only Son*, the next particular in the Creed.

Having thus shewn our Saviour to have been in all respects a Prophet, and moreover assail'd the Jews great objection against his being to be reputed such; proceed we to consider him in his *likeness unto Moses*, according as the Prophecy before alledged doth describe him. Where first, we will take notice of his likeness to him in his nature, and then in the *dignity* of his office.

That the Prophet foretold by *Moses* was to be like unto him in his *nature*, is evident not only from Gods promising by him to raise up that Prophet

<sup>r</sup> Praefat. in Seder Zeraim apud Poc. Port. Mos. p. 16.  
<sup>s</sup> Mal. 4. 4.

<sup>t</sup> Explicat. of the word Father.

Prophet out of their brethren, but from his promising to do it in compliance with that Petition of the Israelites, *that they might not hear any more the voice of the Lord God, nor be acquainted with those dreadful representations of his Majesty*: Both the one and the other plainly importing, that he should be in the form of a man as *Moses* was, and one whom they might converse with without fear. Which though by the Jews alleged against our Saviours being that Prophet, because we do also pretend him to be God; yet doth in truth rather confirm than destroy that analogy, which we have said to be between him and *Moses* as to this particular: Because, though he was God, yet God incarnate, and thereby no less fitted to deliver them from their fears, than invite them to listen to his doctrine. The same evidence there is of his being like unto *Moses* in *dignity*, whether we do consider *Moses* as *seeing God face to face*, which is one Characteristick of him, or in the *wonders* which he wrought, which are another. Witness for the former the Scriptures affirming that "he came" <sup>Joh. 3. 13.</sup> *down from heaven*, yea that he was *there* <sup>Loco citat.</sup> even whilst he was upon earth, that *the bosom of the father* <sup>Joh. 1. 18.</sup> was the place of his abode, and that he was partaker of his divine <sup>Joh. 1. 1.</sup> nature. For who may be presum'd to be acquainted with the face of God, if one so qualify'd and so adorn'd was not? But then for Miracles, which is the second thing for which *Moses* was so renown'd both in the Scriptures and the writings of the Jews; How far superiour, that I say not only like, were those of our Saviour to them, in number, and power, and quality? He gave sight to the blind which *Moses* never did, yea which no man did ever do before him; he made the lame man to leap as an Hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing. Lastly (for I must repeat the four Gospels to make an enumeration of them all) he raised up the dead to life again, yea one who had lien four days in the earth, and, when the time of shewing Miracles upon himself was come, raised up himself also, and ascended in the view of his Disciples into Heaven. Thus did the Holy Jesus approve himself to be a Prophet, yea a Prophet every way equal or rather superiour unto *Moses*: Which as it is a sufficient inducement to listen to his voice, which is the *use* of the Prophet *Moses*, so goes one step farther, indeed as far as is necessary, to demonstrate him to be the *Christ*, which is the thing for which it was alledg'd. For well may he be presum'd to be the *Christ*, in whom, beside other Characters, those so signal dignities did concur. Only if any be so fond as to call also for a proof of that *material* anointing, which the names of Messiah and Christ do seem to import, let him know that as the business of the Messiah hath been shewn to be spiritual and not corporal, and to which therefore a spiritual Unction may suffice; so the Jews themselves <sup>Abarbanel in Comment. ad Exo. 30. apud Simeonem de Muis in Variis Sacris.</sup> make the end of their Unctions to be the *designation* and *sanctification* of the persons, that were to be anointed, to those Offices to which they were inaugurated: Neither of which can be suppos'd to have been wanting there, where the person, we speak of, was first of all replenished with the divine nature, as afterwards both illustrated and pointed out by the visible descent of the Holy Ghost, and a voice too from Heaven to declare and explain it.

# His only Son.

## The Contents.

*In what sense we are to understand Christ to be the Son of God, which is shewn from the Tradition of the Church, and the addition of only to be no other than God of God. A general evidence of this relation out of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, more particularly out of the second Psalm, as also from the opinion of the Jews. A like general evidence of the same Sonship from the Scriptures of the New Testament, more especially from the first Chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. An address to a more particular probation of Christs being so the Son of God, where first of all is shewn from the Scriptures ascribing to him the name, and attributes, and worship of God, that he himself is really such, and secondly, that he receiv'd his divine nature from the father. That this Son of God is also his only one, and how it comes to pass, that the Holy Ghost, receiving the same divine nature from him, hath not yet the title of his Son.*

**His only Son.**

**B**Eing now as the Creed admonisheth to consider of our Saviours Extraction set down in those words, *His only Son*, I shall first of all enquire, what is the sense of it in the *Creed*; secondly, confirm that sense of it out of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament; As that again, first by more *general* proofs, and then by more *particular* ones.

<sup>a</sup> Explic. of the word *Father*.

Of the former of these I have *elsewhere* <sup>a</sup> given an account, and shall therefore need to say the less concerning it now. It may suffice here to note, what was *there* largely prov'd, that as the sense both of the *Ancient* and *Universal* Church obligeth us to understand our Saviour to be so the Son of God, as to be *God of God*, begotten of his substance, and partaker of his nature; so the adjunct of *Only* tends not a little to the confirmation of it: There being no other sense beside that, wherein we can with any propriety of speech affirm our Saviour to have been Gods only Son. For be it, which is true enough, and in the place before refer'd to taken notice of also, that our Saviour may be said to have been the Son of God as conceived by the vertue of his Spirit in the Virgins Womb; yet will it not be very congruous so to affirm him to have been Gods *only* Son, as the Creed obligeth us to do. Because though no man else was ever produc'd by him in the like circumstances, yet both the *Angels* and *Adam* were in *a more peculiar manner* the Sons of God; the former of these, for ought appears, being created out of nothing, as the latter out of such materials as were unapt for such a production, but to be sure more unapt for it than the Womb of a Virgin. Whence it is that both the one and the other have the name of the Sons <sup>b</sup> of God, and may therefore be thought at least to rival our Saviour in it. Be it secondly, which is also true and accordingly alledged by our Saviour himself, that he might be stil'd the Son of God in respect of that Authority wherewith he was invested, yet could he

<sup>b</sup> See for the *Angels*, Job 38. 7. For *Adam*, Luc. 3. 38.



he not be said to be the *only one*, because All Princes are so too, yea fill'd by the August name of *Gods*. Be it lastly, which is a third sense of that appellation, that our Saviour was also the Son of God; inasmuch as by his power receiving a new birth from the Womb of the Earth, yet ought he in that sense to be stil'd rather Gods *first-born* than this only Son; as because his resurrection was attended with that of others, so because it shall at length be followed by the resurrection of us all. So that if the term of *only* or *only begotten* be to be taken in its proper sense, as no man of reason can fancy any other in so short and plain a Summary of Faith, that alone will oblige us to look out for such a Sonship as is not commoti to our Saviour with others, and, because there is no other which is not, to acquiesce in that by which he becomes *God of God*, as the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Creeds express it.

II. For the evidencing whereof from the Scriptures, which is a proof not to be refus'd by those against whom we dispute; I shall first of all alledge some *general* proofs, and then more *particular* ones.

I. Now as there are Jews as well as Christians who are to be satisfied in this affair, and who cannot therefore be convinced by any but their own Scriptures, so I shall therefore alledge against them that known passage of the second Psalm, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*. For that this Psalm is to be understood of the *Messiah* hath been before<sup>a</sup> prov'd at large, and shall therefore be now taken for granted. The only thing to be enquir'd into by us, is its sense, and the evidence there is of its symbolizing with ours. A thing the more carefully to be considered, because even the writers of the New Testament have found out other interpretations of it; St. Paul applying these words to Gods begetting him from the Womb of the Earth to an immortal life (for the promise, saith he<sup>c</sup>, which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfill'd unto us their Children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again, as it is also written in the second Psalm; Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee) as the Author to the Hebrews to the constituting of him Priest; for Christ also, saith he<sup>e</sup>, glorified not himself to be made a High Priest, but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.<sup>f</sup>

And here in the first place I shall desire it may be considered, that the two former interpretations are farther removed from the letter, and indeed rather *allusions* to, than *strict interpretations* of it; Christ being not to be stil'd the *Son of God* in respect of either, but by the help of a very far fetch'd *Metaphor*, which though not therefore to be excluded from being some way intended by it, because of the strange exuberance of the words of Scripture, yet is not in reason to be look'd upon as the *first* and *chiefest* sense of it: Especially, when after those words, *Thou art my Son*, he adds by way of Explication, *This day have I begotten thee*; that *addition* restraining the equivocal name of *son* to such a *sonship*, not as was by *adoption* or any other such *improper* generation, but by a *true* and *proper* begetting. But from hence it will follow; which is the thing we are to establish from it, that the *Messiah* is so the Son of God, as to be *God of God* also; that true and proper begetting whereof we speak being not to be sav'd where one of a like nature is not produc'd. And indeed, as however men may take a liberty to depart from the literal sense of a text, when there is any thing either in the text it self or in others to constrain them to it; yet can it not be thought reasonable where no such thing occurs, yea when, as I shall afterwards shew, there are other texts

to confirm it. For as for that pitiful objection of this Sons being said to be begotten *this day*, as if that design'd some certain point of time in which he was begotten, and before which he was not, it is in truth rather a confirmation of that eternal generation whereof we speak, than any real prejudice to it; the word *hodie* or *this day* being no improper description of eternity, as to which all things are present, nothing to come or past.

To the letter of the Scripture subjoin we the opinion of the Jews themselves, as which, if we find agreeing with that and our sense of it, will not a little confirm it. Now that so it doth, or at least did, before they came to be prejudic'd against it by their great averſation to our *Messiah*, will appear from that account which is given of it by the New Testament, or from what may be collected from their own writings. For did not *Nathaniel*, who had no other account given him of our Saviour than that it was he of whom *Moses in the law and the Prophets did write*. that is to say than the *Messiah*, did not he, I say, as soon as he came to be so perswaded, affirm to him <sup>e</sup>, that he was the *Son of God* as well as the *King of Israel*? Nay, did not that very High Priest, who sat in judgment upon our Saviour, shew himself to have had the same notion of the *Messiah*, when he <sup>b</sup> *adjur'd him by the living of God to tell him whether he were the Christ the Son of God?* For why that addition of the *Son of God*, but that he believ'd the *Messiah* to be such, as well as he who took upon him to be so? But it may be both the one and the other of these had another notion of that Sonship, than that which we endeavour to advance; it may be they look'd upon the *Messiah* as in no other sense the Son of God, than the *Angels* or the *first man* is affirmed to have been. But why then did the forementioned High Priest rent his Cloths, when our Saviour answer'd affirmatively to the question, why did he cry out *Blasphemy* at the pronouncing of it? were it not that he apprehended something extraordinary in that Sonship, and which by usurping to himself our Saviour made himself some way equal to God? Blasphemy in the Scripture notion of it being a contumely toward God, and which therefore to be guilty of a man must either detract from the dignity of God, or lift up himself to it. Though if that inference be not to be allow'd, it is to be hop'd that the Affirmations of the Jews will, and their express declarations concerning this pretended Sonship. For when this *Messiah* of ours did at another time assume that relation, they sought to slay him, because he did by assuming to himself that title *make himself* <sup>i</sup> *equal with God*. But leaving the Scriptures of the New Testament because they are such, though I have not alledg'd them under that notion but only as simple Histories of what pass'd in his time whom we own for the *Messiah*; proceed we to consider of what may be collected from the Jews own writings, and which, because their own, cannot be fairly refus'd. Where first I shall alledge their own *Ancient Doctōrs* <sup>k</sup> expounding the forequoted Psalm of the *Messiah*, and the Modern as carefully departing from that Exposition, as that too for fear of gratifying the Christians. For as it is evident from the former of these, that the Ancient Jewish Church believ'd the *Messiah* to be the Son of God and begotten by him because so declar'd by that Psalm; so it is more than probable the latter thought no small advantage might be made of it toward the confirming of that Sonship which we propugn: There being no other notion in that Psalm which should make them so shy of it, yea which doth not well com-

<sup>e</sup> Joh. 1. 49.

<sup>b</sup> Mat. 26. 63.

<sup>i</sup> Joh. 5. 18.

<sup>k</sup> See Explicat.  
of the word  
*Christ*.

port

port with their own conceptions concerning the Messiah. I alledge secondly, their own *Maimonides*<sup>1</sup>, expounding that Psalm of the Messiah, *yea so expounding this very passage of it, and inferring from thence his standing in a near degree to his Creator.* For though that do not persuade that Sonship which we speak of, but rather the contrary, yet it shews him to have *opin'd* a more near relation to be understood, than they are commonly willing to allow. But of all the proofs which the Jewish writings do afford concerning their believing such a Sonship as we maintain, there seems to me to be none more cogent than the *Septuagints* interpreting those words of the Psalmist<sup>m</sup>, *from the womb of the morning thou hast the dew of thy youth*, by *ἐκ γαστρὸς καὶ ὕδατος ὑγρῆς*<sup>2</sup>. For whatever become of that interpretation of theirs, which I for my part shall not go about to maintain, because I believe the *modern* one to be preferable to it; yet when it is known and confess'd by the Jews, that that whole Psalm is to be understood of the Messiah, who can make any other inference from that expression of theirs, than that they believ'd him to have been begotten by God before the world was, or from eternity, as the Prophet *Micah*<sup>3</sup> expressly affirms where he saith that *his goings forth have been from old, from everlasting*? For as the sense of those words of the *Septuagint* is no other than that *God begat him before the day*, or rather *before the first dawn of it*; so we cannot well understand them of *any other day* than *that which gave beginning to the creation*; Especially, when we find God himself to have given a like description of his own eternity, where he enters into a contest with all other pretenders to the Deity. For thus among other his Divine Excellencies we find him recounting it<sup>4</sup>, *Before the day was I am he, and there is no man that can deliver out of my hand.* To all which if we add the evidence their own Scriptures do afford us of the Messiah's partaking of his Divine Nature to whom he is affirmed to be a Son, so no doubt can remain of his being *so the Son of God* as to be *God of God* also: As because the attributing to him an uncommunicated Deity would infer a multiplicity of Gods; so because it cannot appear how the Father should send him upon his errands, if he did not receive his Godhead from him. Now that the Scriptures of the Old Testament are not without a proof of his Godhead whom they represent as the Messiah, that one place of the Prophet I say<sup>5</sup> which is by the *Chaldee Paraphrast* as well as us understood of the *Messiah*, may serve for an abundant evidence. It being there affirm'd concerning *that child* that should be *born*, and *that Son* that should be given to take the government upon his shoulders; that *his name* should be called *wonderful counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of peace.* For how come such Elogies as those to be bestow'd upon him, if there were not in him that Divine Nature whereof we speak?

I have now done with the *Jews* who were first to be dealt withal in this particular, as from whom it may be some of our own have imbib'd the same prejudices; I come now to address my self to those who call themselves *Christians*, but can as little be induced to believe that relation whereof we speak. And here in the first place I shall again appeal to the former passage of the Psalmist, though not as lying in him, but as quoted by the Author to the *Hebrews*, and together with those advantages wherewith he presents it. For demanding, as he doth<sup>6</sup>, *to which of the Angels said he at any time, thou art my son this day have I be-*  

3

gotten



gotten thee, he thereby supposeth such a Sonship to be attributed to him as is not competible to any creature, no not to the most glorious ones the Angels. Now what Sonship can that be but a true and natural one, and by which our Saviour became God of God, as the forementioned Creed expresseth it, the issue not of his power and will, but of his essence? All other grounds of Sonship being common to him with other beings, and particularly with the *Angels* or *Princes*. But then if it be considered, what the same Apostle hath said both in the foregoing and following verses of that chapter, calling him in the *third* verse *the brightness of God's glory, and the express image of his person*, as in the *sixth* verse again bringing in the *Angels of God worshipping him*; If we consider yet farther that he gives him afterwards the titles of *God*<sup>r</sup> and *Lord*<sup>s</sup>, yea ascribes to him *the creation of the world*<sup>3</sup>. So it will be impossible to understand that Apostle or the Psalmist of intending any other than Christ's being the *true and proper Son of God*, and one whom he had begotten in his own infinite and eternal Majesty. One thing only there is which may seem to be some prejudice to this assertion, and so much the rather because it fell from him whose dignity we are asserting, and at a time too, when he may seem to have been under an obligation to assert it himself. For when our Saviour upon his affirming himself to be the *Son of God*, and *one with him*, was charg'd by his adversaries with blasphemy, he instead of maintaining what he had before affirm'd, endeavour'd to avert that charge by demanding of them<sup>1</sup>, why he might not stile himself the Son of God upon the account of his own *sanctification and mission*, as well as the Scripture gave the name of *Gods* to those who were invested with his authority; Thereby, as one might imagine, renouncing any other Sonship, than what may seem to have been competible to other persons. But beside that our Saviour doth not in that answer deny himself to be so also the Son of God as to be one and equal with him; beside that in the following words he doth again not obscurely insinuate it by affirming<sup>2</sup> that *the works which he did shewed the father to be in him* and he again *in the father* (for which cause the Jews who before thought to have ston'd him did again<sup>3</sup> seek to take him;) There may have been sufficient reason why our Saviour should then be sparing in the declaration of his eternal power and Godhead: Whether it were, as I should think, to avoid his dying before the appointed hour, upon which account we find him sometime to have withdrawn himself; or, which perhaps is no less probable, because his own Disciples were not then able to bear it, by reason of their own weakness as well as our Saviour's present inglorious circumstances. Sure I am, as our Saviour forbore the saying of many things<sup>4</sup> because of their then *inability to bear them*, so it is not unlikely he might for the same reason be a little reserv'd in some of those things he did, and because he knew the Spirit of God would afterwards bring them to their remembrance<sup>5</sup>, and open their understandings in them. But beside that so remarkable a passage which the second Psalm presents us with, and those no less considerable advantages wherewith it is attended in the first Chapter of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, it is not at all to be despis'd that he of whom we speak hath so often in the Scripture the title of *God's only begotten Son*. For as it doth not appear how he can be stil'd the *only begotten* of the Father, than as he is *God of God*, so there is far less reason to transfer that title from its native sense, to that of one who is *beloved* of his Father: The word *μωυγενής* though

<sup>1</sup> Heb. 1. 8.<sup>2</sup> — 10.<sup>3</sup> Ibid.<sup>4</sup> Joh. 10. 34.  
&c.<sup>5</sup> Ibid. 38.<sup>6</sup> — 39.<sup>7</sup> Joh. 16. 12.<sup>8</sup> Joh. 14. 26.

though it should be sometime so us'd, which yet doth not appear<sup>b</sup>; yet being not in reason so to be understood when it is attributed to him, concerning whom the Scripture demands, *To which even of the Angels did God say at any time thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee.* For whatever be the sense of those words, they must be thought to import thus much at least, that Christ is so the Son of God as no other person is, and therefore so far an *only* one. But so also would it be considered, how supposing *only begotten* to signifie less than *God of God*, any tolerable account can be given of St. John's affirming himself and others<sup>c</sup> to have beheld the glory of the Word as the glory of the *only begotten of the father*: The glory of the *only begotten of the father* being a very ill description of the glory of the Word; if it do not import the same *divinity* in it, which is by St. John in the beginning of that Chapter so clearly and expressly attributed to the other.

2. From general proofs pass we to particular ones, which agreeably to the matter in hand, I will rank under these two heads, to wit such as demonstrate our Saviour to be so the *Son of God*, and such as shew him to be his *only one*.

The former of these will again require a double proof answerably to that *double notion* which the term of Son imports, to wit such a one as will shew him to be truly and properly *God*, and such a one as will shew him to have *receiv'd* that Godhead of his from the Father.

Now that our Saviour is truly and properly *God*, which is the first and indeed principal thing to be demonstrated, will appear from the Scriptures attributing to him,

1. The Name.
2. The Attributes.
3. The Worship of God.

1. I begin with the first of these, even the Scriptures attributing to our Saviour the *Name* of God, and which is so often found done, that it neither is nor can be deni'd by those who make it their business to rob him of the honour of one. Only as where there is any the least hopes of shuffling off that name to God the Father, they stick not to employ all their endeavours to effect it; so where they cannot, they think to choak us with God's imparting of this name to others, and particularly to his Ministers and Vicegerents. Of the former of these we have an illustrious instance in that of St. Paul<sup>d</sup>, where he obligeth the Elders of Ephesus to feed the Church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood. For howsoever they themselves acknowledge the blood here spoken of to be no other than the blood of our Lord and Saviour, yet would they make the world believe that the God before spoken of is no other than God the Father. But for what reason think you, but because of the intimate conjunction there is between God and Christ, and by vertue whereof the blood of Christ may be affirm'd to be his? But beside that they themselves cannot deny that the *Name* of God is elsewhere given to our Saviour, as in like manner, more often than unto the father the redemption of his Church; What can we say that may be in the least measure satisfactory, as to what is there affirm'd concerning this God's purchasing it with *his own proper* blood? For to whom can this be well referr'd but to him who shed it, and to whom certainly it was proper, if to any? From this first subterfuge therefore pass we to the second, even that which pretends not so much to deny the appellation, as

<sup>b</sup> Vid. Incr. p. 42.  
Bar. Jesu. Sect.

<sup>c</sup> Joh. i. 14.

<sup>d</sup> Act. 20. 28.

<sup>e</sup> Διὰ τοῦ αἵματος  
ἀγαποῦ.

to shew that it is sometime us'd in a lower sense, than that wherein we are willing to understand it. Be it so, but doth it therefore follow that we are so to understand it, when spoken of our Saviour? Or may not a name be so circumstantiated and attended, as to shew him, to whom it is attributed, to be really and properly what it imports? Now it is from the name of God so considered that we argue the Divinity of our Saviour, and as we think too, with so good effect, that it is not possible to avoid the force of it. For who can think the name of God to be other than properly predicated, where he who is affirmed to be God <sup>f</sup> is said to have been *in the beginning with God*, as in like manner to have been one *by whom all things were made, and without whom nothing was made, that was made at all*? Who can think the same name to be other than properly predicated, when as it is in another place <sup>g</sup>, he who is called God is said to *uphold all things by the word of his power*, to be *worshipped by the Angels*, to have *given beginning to the heavens and earth*, and to be *without any end or change himself*? Lastly, who can think the name of God to be other than properly predicated, when as it is in a third place <sup>h</sup>, he, who is affirmed to be God, is moreover affirm'd to be *over all God blessed for ever*? For what more could be said to describe to us the Godhead of him, whom they, as well as we, own to be so, I mean the Father.

2. To the name of God subjoin we the same Scriptures affixing to our Saviour the undoubted *attributes* of God, and so much the rather, because those have been now made use of to give force unto his name. Where first, who is there that sees not how much it may contribute to the proof of his Divinity, to shew this our Saviour to have been *Eternal*? Even they, who ascrib'd a being to him long before his conception of the Virgin, yet as carefully asserting that *there was a time when he was not*. Now that our Saviour was really eternal, will appear from such Texts of Scripture as attribute that great dignity to him, whether expressly or by consequence. Of the former nature is that of St. *John* <sup>i</sup>, or rather of our Saviour, by whom he is brought in affirming that he was *the first and the last*. For as to us, who by reason of our own finiteness cannot have any adequate conception of eternity, there can be no more significant description of it; So it is no other than that whereby the Father describes himself in the Old Testament, yea represents as a character of his Divinity. For thus in one place <sup>k</sup> we find him asking, *Who hath wrought and done it, calling the generations from the beginning? I the Lord, the first and with the last, I am he*: As in another affirming in these signal words <sup>l</sup>, *Thus saith the Lord the King of Israel, and his redeemer the Lord of Hosts, I am the first, and I am the last, and beside me there is no God*. For who sees not that this was intended as a characteristick note of his Divinity, and therefore not to be thought to have been usurped by his Son, had he not also thought it no robbery to assume to himself his nature? But so also will his eternity appear from the beginning of St. *John's* Gospel, as that too both directly and by consequence; because not only affirming him to have been *in the beginning*, and therefore not to have had *any such* himself, but affirming moreover that *all things were made by him*, yea that *without him was not any thing made that was made*: He, who gave being to all things that were made, being not in the number of them himself, and therefore to be look'd upon as eternal. Only lest the Socinians should reply



as they are wont to do unreasonably enough, that by the *beginning* before spoken of we are to understand the *beginning of the Gospel age*, and not the beginning of the world; I think it not amiss to answer (though the truth is the objection doth not deserve one) that God did by this *Word* or Son of his, as the Author to the Hebrews speaks<sup>m</sup>, make not this or that age, but *the ages* in general or *the worlds*; That the same Author doth afterwards apply to him<sup>n</sup> that passage of the Psalmist, *And thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thine hands*; In fine, that our Saviour prays to the Father<sup>o</sup> to glorify him with that glory which he had with him before the world was; Which shews that he was in the beginning of the Creation, as well as of the Gospel age, yea that he gave beginning to the several beings of it. The eternity of our Saviour being thus established, and together therewith that *Almighty* power which shew'd it self in the creation of the World, we shall the less need to shew that he wanted not other attributes of the Deity, because inseparable from that. Only I think it not amiss to add, that when our Saviour ask'd St. Peter after the resurrection whether he lov'd him, he made answer more than once *thou knowest that I love thee*, but in the end *Lord P thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee*; so grounding that knowledge which he had of St. Peter's love, not upon any visible effects of it, but upon our Saviour's Divine Knowledge of all things. Of which yet if that passage may not serve for a sufficient proof, that of St. John will, because attesting to his knowledge of that which is certainly most difficult to be known, even the hearts and purposes of men: It being affirm'd by him<sup>q</sup> that he needed not that any man should testify of men, because he himself knew what was in man. That of St. Paul shall put a period to this particular, because a proof of his wanting nothing that was really Divine; It being affirmed by him<sup>r</sup> that as our Saviour was in the form or essence of God, so he thought it no robbery at all to be equal with God, which he could not have done, if he had wanted any of his perfections.

3. And indeed, if as he had not been that God which he pretended to be, it is not to be thought that he himself would have challenged such perfections to himself, or suffered them to have been given him by others; so we have as little reason to think that God would have oblig'd the Angels to worship him, as all men to honour him as they honour the Father; that he himself would not have refus'd those prostrations that were often made before him upon earth, or that St. Stephen, when he was now a dying would have pray'd "Lord Jesus receive my spirit." In fine that every creature<sup>x</sup> which is in heaven and on the earth and under the earth should conspire in giving blessing honour, glory and power unto this son of God for ever and ever, as well as, and together with him that sat upon the throne. For how, supposing our Saviour not to have been truly and properly God, are those things consistent with God's affirming, that he will not give his glory unto another? Or how will those men, who represent our Saviour as a creature, be able to defend themselves against those, from whom they profess to have alike departed, even the worshippers of glorified saints and Angels?

Of the Godhead of our Saviour what hath been said may suffice, especially considering with what strength and clearness this great truth hath been establish'd by a learned Prelate of our own<sup>z</sup>; I come now  
to Creed.

† John 5. 26.

† John 7. 29.

to shew that he *receiv'd this his Godhead* from the Father. But beside that this is in a great measure evident from those Scriptures I before made use of to evince him to be the Son of God; neither is it deni'd at all by those with whom we dispute, nor would it require any long probation, if it were: He, whose Sonship is now under consideration, affirming, that <sup>a</sup> though he had *life in himself*, yet it was *the father* that gave him that special privilege, that he *was from him* and <sup>b</sup> *sent by him*. Which two last passages, though to be understood of his coming into the World, yet prove also the derivation of his divine being from him; there appearing not otherwise any ground of the Fathers employing him in that work, or of the Sons complying with him in it. In short, suppose him not to have deriv'd this divine nature from the Father, and you will not only destroy the distinction between the persons, but introduce a multiplicity of Gods, there appearing not any means, how one and the same divine nature should be common to the three persons, unless one of them should communicate it to the other.

I will conclude this Article when I have added, that, as Christ is the true and proper Son of God, because partaking of his divine nature, and deriving it from him, so the Scripture knows no other Son than him, yea represents him as the *only begotten* of the father. Only because the *spirit of God* may seem to rival him in this particular, because partaking of the same divine nature and image, and receiving them both from him; I think it but necessary to subjoin, that, as the Scripture, which is the only judge of things of this nature, affirms the divinity of the Holy Ghost to have been not by *generation* but *procession*, so there is this to justify that distinction, that whereas the Divinity of the Son is only from the Father, that of the Holy Ghost is from both. For neither can he be said to be *the begotten of the Father*, who receives his divinity from him in conjunction with the Son, nor yet, because they are different principles, to be *the begotten* of them both: Paternity no more than Sovereignty admitting of any Partners, and therefore neither permitting that *Holy Ghost*, who receives his divine nature from them both, to be or to be called the *begotten* of them.

# Our Lord.

## The Contents.

*The name of Lord the title not of his divine nature but of his Dominion, which is shewn to be twofold, to wit such as appertains to him as the Son of God, and such as appertains to him as the Son of God incarnate. The ground of the former of these his Creation of the world, of the latter his redemption of mankind, which is also shewn to be a true and proper redemption. The former of these Dominions brought again under consideration, and accordingly enquiry made Of what extent it is, What powers it doth contain, both which are shewn to be Universal; As also From what time this Dominion did commence, and Of what continuance it is, where in like manner is shewn that it began from the Creation, and shall last for ever. An address to the consideration of that Dominion of his which ariseth from Redemption, where again is enquir'd first, What the importance thereof is, which is shewn to stand in a power to lay his commands upon us, in rescuing us from the power of our Enemies, and punishing us if we disobey him. Enquiry is made secondly, What force it receives from his other Dominion which is also shewn to be so far forth, as the powers thereof are divine. Enquiry is made thirdly, from what time this Dominion did commence, where is shewn at large that it is as old as the fall of man, or at least the promise of a redeemer; As fourthly and lastly, how long it shall continue, where is also shewn that it shall continue in some measure for ever.*

**W**E have consider'd our Saviour hitherto as the *only Son of God*, **Our Lord**: or rather, because that is the true notion of his Sonship, as *God of God*: We are now to consider him with relation to our selves, and as to that Dominion over us which the words *Our Lord* import. For though the name *Jehovah*, by which the essence of God is denoted, be by the Greek Translators of the Bible render'd, *κύριος* or *Lord*, though that name be not only competent to *Christ*, but more over attributed by the Scripture to him; Yet is there little reason to suppose that to be the sense of it in the *Creed*, or indeed in those many Scriptures which give our Saviour the same title: Partly, because his divine nature is sufficiently impli'd in that Sonship, which is before attributed to him, and partly, because the title of *Lord*, both in the *Creed* and the Scripture, is the peculiar elogy of the Son. For how comes that title to be the peculiar elogy of the Son, which, according to the former notion is but common to him with the other two persons, or which, if to be attributed to any one of them in a more eminent manner, doth undoubtedly belong to him who is the *root* and *fountain* of the Deity? From all which as it doth appear that *that* is not the sense of it in the *Creed*, how true soever it may be; yea is, that he is in that respect also *Our Lord*; so it will therefore be necessary for us, because there is no other

<sup>a</sup> Jer. 23. 6. as  
also Joel 2. 32.  
comp. with  
Rom. 10. 13.



other sense of it, to understand him to be so *Our Lord*, as one who hath *Dominion over us*, by what ways or means soever that *Dominion* may be supposed to be acquir'd.

Now as he, concerning whose *Dominion* we are now enquiring, may be considered either as the *Son of God*, or as the *Son of God incarnate for our Redemption*, so proportionably thereto we shall find him to have a double *Dominion*; whereof the *former* ariseth from his *creation* of us and of all the world, the latter from the *redemption* of us. That he becomes *our Lord* by the former of these, we have not only for our warrant all those texts of Scripture which attribute to him the *Creation* of the World, but, which is of yet more force, *St. Paul's* grounding that *Dominion* of his upon it, and inferring his *Dominion* from it. For after he had said, that, whatever there may be among other men, yet to us Christians there is but *one God the father of whom are all things and we in him*,<sup>b</sup> he immediately subjoins<sup>c</sup>, *and one Lord Jesus Christ by whom are all things and we by him*; Thereby plainly intimating that *Dominion* of his to arise from that interest he hath in our *Creation*, and of all other things which are in like manner the object of it. As indeed well may he be said to be our Lord in that respect, when this is the original ground of the *Dominion* of *him*, who is the *father* of our Lord Jesus Christ as well as ours. Only because he, whom we thus entitle *Lord*, hath that title in a more peculiar manner than either of the other persons of the *Trinity* (the name of *Lord* being not only set to distinguish him<sup>e</sup> from them, but he represented in the place but now quoted as the *one Lord* whom Christianity acknowledgeth) I think it but just to add, that that *Dominion* which belongs to him by *Creation*, becomes yet more peculiar to him by the fathers putting the administration thereof into his hands. Of which if any doubt be made, that of our Saviour<sup>d</sup> will clear it, where he manifestly entreats of this his own *Divine nature*; He there telling us that *the father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son*. For how can he be thought other than a singular *Lord*, who hath not only a title to that *Dignity* by the common *Creation* of the World, but by the *Commission* of the Father, to whom this *Dominion* originally belongs, and by whom the administration thereof is vested in him?

An account being thus given of that *Dominion* of our Saviour which ariseth from the *Creation* of the World, we are in the next place to enquire whether he hath not a more peculiar *Dominion* over us by virtue of that *Redemption* which he afterwards accomplished. A thing not to be doubted of, whether we consider the several grounds of *Dominion*, or the account the Scripture gives us of this. For whereas all *Dominion* that is not *natural*, ariseth either from conquest or purchase, thus much is clear from the language of the Scripture as well as from its doctrine, that Christ is *our Lord* by the latter of these; *St. Paul* telling us in one place that *we are not our own*<sup>e</sup>, because we are *bought with a price*, as elsewhere<sup>f</sup> more particularly, that we are *the servants of Christ* for the same reason (for it immediately follows *ye are bought with a price*) which shews him to be *our Lord* because of it. Only because there are who are unwilling to acknowledge so great an obligation, and have therefore represented that *redemption* whereof we speak as a *simple deliverance* of us from punishment, as that too, rather by bringing us to repentance for our sins, than by paying any thing for us; I think it but just to take off that umbrage, and so more firmly establish Christ's *Dominion* and our obligation

<sup>b</sup> 1 Cor. 8. 6.

<sup>c</sup> 2 Cor. 13. 14.  
Eph. 6. 23.

<sup>d</sup> Joh. 5. 22.

<sup>e</sup> 1 Cor. 6. 20.

<sup>f</sup> 1 Cor. 7. 22.  
23.

ligation to him. For I demand of any man, who lists not to be contentious, how we can possibly understand any other than a true and proper redemption, when the Scripture, as was but now shewn, argues from it our being *the Servants* of Christ. For is not the redemption of a *servant* a true and proper redemption, is it not made by paying a valuable consideration for him? And shall not that therefore be look'd upon as such, which is not only resembled to it, but from which also the Scripture concludes us to be the *servants* of him by whom we are so redeem'd? I demand secondly, what there is in a true and proper redemption which is not to be found here. Doth a redemption suppose him who is the object of it to have been obnoxious to his former owners power, yea so far, that it might have been lawful for him to have put him to death if he had pleas'd? But our many sins as well as the threats of the divine law make it evident, that we had forfeited our lives to the divine justice, and that therefore, if he had pleas'd, he might have taken that advantage of us. Again, doth that redemption suppose the paying of a valuable consideration for the thing redeem'd, and such as may be thought to content him from whom it is so? But neither is it less evident, that this was also observ'd by him by whom we are said to have been redeem'd: The Scripture giving us to understand more than once, that he bought us with a *price*, as that too which was more *precious* <sup>g</sup> *than silver and gold*, because no other than the *precious blood of Christ*, yea *the blood of God*. <sup>h</sup> For where there is both a price and a valuable one, what can it be other than a true and proper redemption? Or how he any other than our Lord by whom we were so redeem'd, or we than his Servants and Vassals.

It appearing from the premises that this Lord whereof we speak hath a double dominion over us, we shall not be long to seek which is especially to be understood in the Creed, because making *us men* upon the matter the sole objects of it. For so we cannot be said to be of that Dominion which ariseth from Creation, because all things, that are the object of *that*, must be so also of the *other*. Only because there is no necessity of excluding that Dominion altogether, and, beside that, the knowledge thereof may confer not a little to the understanding of the other, I think it but just to enquire,

1. Of what extent this Dominion is.
2. What powers it doth contain in it.
3. From what time it did commence.
4. Of what continuance it is.

i. As to the first of these much need not be said, after I have shewn it to arise from Creation. For there being not any thing <sup>k</sup> *which was made* <sup>l</sup> *without* this Lord of ours, yea which *was not made by him*; his dominion so considered must of necessity be *universal*, and extend as far as that Creation which is the proper foundation of it. Whence it is, that we do not only find him stil'd *the heir* <sup>1</sup> or Lord <sup>m</sup> *of all things*, but those, <sup>n</sup> *whose nature he assumed not*, call'd upon to *worship* <sup>o</sup> *him*, as well as those whose nature he did.

2. But neither after the discovery of that ground, and the concurring Commission of the Father, shall I be at all put to it to shew *what powers* it doth contain. For so it will be found to extend to the doing or enjoining of any thing, which shall be found to be within the compass of the divine. For which cause *Divine adoration* is within the compass of its commands, and accordingly (as was but now intimated) was both

T

enjoin'd

<sup>g</sup> 1 Pet. i. 18, 19;<sup>h</sup> Act. 20. 28;<sup>k</sup> Joh. i. 3.<sup>l</sup> Heb. i. 2.<sup>m</sup> Act. 10. 36;<sup>n</sup> Heb. 2. 16.<sup>o</sup> Heb. i. 6.

enjoin'd upon, and paid by the most glorious parts of the Creation, the Angels.

3. But neither thirdly, for the same reason, shall we find any difficulty at all in assigning *from what time it did commence*. For being founded in the Creation it must begin from thence, and, that I may add that by the way, continue also in force, so long as any created being shall continue. If any thing may seem to prejudice this Assertion, it must be the little appearance there is of our Saviours exercising any Dominion before his Incarnation for our Redemption, or at least without regard to it. For as it is hard to believe, that, if he had a Dominion from the beginning, we should not meet with any expresses of it before he became *incarnate*, so there is presumption enough of his future redemptions, giving him a Dominion over the World, even before the accomplishing of it, as by which, they, who liv'd before it, are believ'd to have been sav'd no less than they who liv'd in, or after the time of it. To give therefore the more sure establishment to this so great and early a Dominion, I will make it my business to shew,

1. That our Saviour had and exercis'd a Dominion before his Incarnation for our redemption. As

2. That that redemption cannot be suppos'd to have given him a right to all that Dominion which he then exercis'd.

1. Now that this *Lord* whereof we speak, both *had* and *exercis'd* a *Dominion before his incarnation for our redemption*, will appear if we consider what the New Testament hath affirm'd concerning both him and his operations. For doth not that assure us of his having been *from the beginning* °, of his *giving being* to the world <sup>p</sup> and *upholding all things* in it? And is not that a proof of his operating as well as being before his Incarnation? Or can we suppose him so to operate, and not also to exercise Dominion over that world which he did both make and uphold?

° Joh. 1. 1.

° Heb. 1. 2, 3.

2. Doth not the same New Testament admonish us *not to tempt* <sup>q</sup> *Christ*, as *some of the Israelites also tempted*, and were for that temptation *destroy'd by serpents* ? And was it possible for them to tempt him, unless he then presided over them? Nay was that temptation any other than the murmuring against him <sup>r</sup> for bringing them out of *Egypt*, did not he whom they thus tempted send fiery Serpents among them for it? Which what was it but to say, that he then exercis'd both parts of his Dominion, and did both take care of them and punish them? Lastly, doth not the same

° Num. 21. 3, 6.

° Heb. 11. 26.

° Ib. vers. 25.

New Testament assure us that *Moses suffered the reproach of Christ* <sup>s</sup>, doth it not represent him as so suffering, because *suffering affliction with the* <sup>t</sup> *people of God* ? And can it then be deni'd that Christ then was, and presided over them, could *Moses* be otherwise *reproach'd for Christ*, or *Christ be reproach'd* in him? I am not ignorant what hath been said to take off the force of these two last texts, as men will never want answers to elude those Scriptures which are not consistent with their respective prejudices. But as it is a poor thing to say upon the Authority of *one single Manuscript*, that those first words ought to be read, *neither let us tempt God as some of them also did*; so it is not much better to interpret the *reproach of Christ*, by the reproach Christ afterwards was to suffer, or by the reproach of those people that expected him: Especially, if it may also appear, what I come now to shew, that the Old Testament is not without evidence of this Son of Gods presiding over the Israelites, and in Gods name and stead watching over them and commanding them. For the

evidencing



evidencing whereof I shall alledge that known place of *Exodus*<sup>a</sup>, where God is brought in saying unto *Moses* that he would send his Angel before them to keep them in the way, and bring them into the place which he had prepar'd: He there admonishing as to this Angel, that they should beware of him and obey his voice, and not provoke him; as who would not pardon their sins, because Gods name was in him, or in his<sup>b</sup> inwards. <sup>Exo. 23. 20, 21, &c.</sup> <sup>ח בקרו</sup>

For when it is apparant that God neither will, nor can give his glory to a Creature, who can deem him to have been a Created Angel, in whose inwards Gods name is not only said to be, but those, who were committed to his charge, admonish'd to beware of him and to obey him, to have a care how they provok'd him, as one who would not pardon them? For what more could have been said, if he had been the eternal Son of God himself, one who was begotten of his essence and partaker of his nature? And though it be true that it is not said that he was that eternal Son of God, which may seem to be some prejudice to what we would infer; Yet as we cannot well think him to be any other than a person in the Trinity, yea one who deriv'd his essence from the Father because sent by him, so neither can we well doubt of his being that Son of God who was afterwards to be the Messiah: Especially when we find that Son and intended Messiah stil'd by *Malachi* y Gods Angel or Messenger, yea the Angel<sup>c</sup> or Messenger of the Covenant. The same is to be said of that Angel which appear'd to *Joshua*<sup>d</sup>, and who both represented himself as Captain of the Lords Hosts, and was saluted by *Joshua* as his Lord. For how, supposing him not to have been the eternal Son of God, came *Joshua* to worship him, or he not to refuse it from him? Whereas when meer Angels appear'd they refus'd such divine honours, as is plain in those Angels that appear'd to *Manoah*<sup>e</sup> and Saint *John*<sup>f</sup>. For as it is evident from thence that the Angel before spoken of can be no other than the Son of God, and the Angel of the Covenant; So it appears no less from the title he gave himself, and from the business of his coming, that his design was to fight for them, and exercise that Dominion wherewith he was invested. I may not dismiss this Argument before I have reminded you of a proof before<sup>g</sup> insisted on, but which will deserve a new consideration here; That I mean, which gives us an account of those Angels that appear'd to *Abraham*, and acquainted him with the intended destruction of *Sodom*. For as it's apparant from the account before given of it, that that Angel who had the title of *Jehovah* can be no other than the eternal Son of God; so is it no less from the same place, that he was the immediate inflicter of that fatal vengeance, which fell upon that wicked place.

2. Having thus made it appear that this Lord, whereof we speak, both had and exercis'd a Dominion before his incarnation for our redemption, it will be but just to enquire (because otherwise this Dominion of his may be attributed to his future redemption) what appearance there is of his having so exercis'd it with respect to his interest in the Creation, and that Commission, which, as Son of God, he receiv'd from the Father. For the resolution whereof I will shew first, that there is no necessity of attributing all that Dominion to his future redemption, as secondly, that that redemption cannot be supposed to have given him all that Dominion; which we have shew'd him to have exercis'd in the world. That there is no necessity of attributing all that Dominion which he exercis'd to that redemption which he afterwards accomplish'd, may appear from hence, that there

there is a power in God, as Lord of the world, to execute judgment upon those who shall be found to be disobedient to his commands. For as if the power of punishing belong to God as such, there is no doubt it is also in his power to execute it himself, or delegate his Son to do it; So there is therefore no necessity at all of attributing it to any other cause, and particularly to our Saviours redemption: This however it might be necessary to enable him to save Sinners, yet being not alike necessary to Authorize him to condemn them. But neither is it less evident, that *that* redemption whereof we speak cannot be suppos'd to have given him a right to all that Dominion which we have shewn him to have exercis'd in the World. For neither could it give him a right to execute vengeance upon those, who neither rejected his Salvation, nor set themselves against those that embrac'd it. For that Dominion, which he acquir'd thereby, being design'd rather for the benefit than to the disadvantage of those who were to be the subjects of it, it cannot be suppos'd to have any inauspicious influence, where that Salvation was not first rejected, or they, who embrac'd it, were oppos'd. Which will consequently exclude those from the power of it, by whom no such Dominion was ever heard of, nor any opposition made to the Subjects of it. But such, so far as we can judge, were the *Sodomites* before remembred, whom yet this Lord of ours descended to visit and punish; And they therefore to be suppos'd to have suffer'd by him, not by vertue of that Dominion which he acquir'd by his redemption, but by that which belong'd to him as the Creator of the world, and together with, and under the Father, administering the affairs of it. I should think in like manner, and for the same reason, that we ought to attribute to the same Dominion, what power he did at any time exert to the temporal behoof of those who were perfect strangers to his redemption; Because however alike capable of receiving benefit by it, yet not put into a condition of obtaining it, and therefore neither to be suppos'd to partake of the benefit of that Dominion, which was founded in the vertue of it.

4. The only thing remaining to be enquir'd into, is of *what continuance* that Dominion is, which we have said to arise from Creation, and the Commission of the Father. But neither of this can any doubt be made by those who consider the grounds of it, and particularly that Creation from which it flows. For however it may fare as to that particular administration of it, which we have now said to belong to the Son, when, as the <sup>[1 Cor. 15, 28.]</sup> Apostle speaks<sup>d</sup>, God shall be all in all; yet thus much must be granted by reason of his interest in the Creation, that it shall continue, as to the thing it self, so long as created beings shall, because founded in the Creation of them.

To go on now to consider of that *Dominion* which we have said to arise from *Redemption*, and by vertue of which it is that he becomes more particularly *Our Lord*; where again I will enquire,

1. What the importance of this his Dominion is.
2. What force it receives from his other Dominion.
3. From what time this Dominion of his did commence.
4. How long it shall continue.

1. Now there are three things wherein this Dominion stands, first in a power to lay his commands upon us; Secondly in rescuing us from the power of our Enemies; As thirdly and lastly, in punishing us if we disobey him. Of the first of these no doubt at all is to be made, because all Dominion,

Dominion, as such, subjects those, who are the objects of it, to the power of him in whom it is. Whence it is, that, as Christianity tells us *we are not our own*, so it prompts us to the obedience of him. But so is it also evident, that it is the purport of that Dominion of his to rescue us from the power of our respective Enemies; Because, however other Dominions may leave the owners of them to their own arbitrement, yet the like is not to be said of this, because design'd for the benefit of those over whom it is granted to him. Whence it is, that we do not only find him travelling incessantly for the rescuing of us from *sin*, which is one of the great *Enemies* we have to encounter with; but are moreover assur'd that he will deliver us from *death*, which, though *the last enemy that shall be destroy'd*, yet shall in fine infallibly be. It is in like manner evident thirdly, that it is within the compass of the same Dominion to punish us if we be disobedient to him; Not only the general nature of Dominion obliging us so to affirm, but the many threats the Book of God presents us with against those who shall not *serve this Lord*, nor pay him that subjection which he requires. Upon which account it is also, that the power of *judgment* is committed to him, and the awarding to the disobedient the punishment of Hell fire, as well as admitting those, who have been faithful servants, to the participation of his glories.

2. It appearing from the premises, what the *importance* of that dominion is, which is the subject of our present consideration, we shall not be long to seek *what force it receives* from that Dominion, which we have said to belong to him as the Son of God. For as if there be any thing of *Divine* in it, it must have the concurrence of that, because Redemption, as such, cannot entitle the Author of it to one that is divine; so, *so far* therefore as it is divine, it must be suppos'd to receive its force from it, and not from any innate power of its own. To make it therefore evident, what force it receives from that other Dominion, it will be requisite for us to resume the powers before remembred, and enquire how far forth they are divine.

But such I should think it, *to be able to command the honouring of himself with divine honours*, which yet it is apparant this Dominion of our Saviours enabled him to challenge. For what other can we make of that known place of St. Paul<sup>e</sup>, that, because the Son of God *humbled himself* as is there express'd, therefore God had *given him a name above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father*. For beside that, as *Grotius* hath well observed, this expression is borrowed from the Prophet *Isaiah*<sup>s</sup>, where God makes use of the *bowing of every knee to him* to express his own infinite greatness; How can we otherwise suppose that Prayer of our Saviour answer'd, wherein he beg'd of God<sup>h</sup> that he would *glorifie him with that glory which he had with him before the world was*? Nay how can we think this exaltation of his name to have answered his precedent exinanition, and that glory from which he did descend? It being certain, that, before his incarnation, he had the honour of a God, and less than which therefore cannot be suppos'd to be a proportionable recompence for that low estate to which he did descend. Now I ask upon what account so great a Dominion comes to be due to him, that he should challenge by virtue of it no less than divine honours? Shall we say upon the single account of that redemption



redemption which he accomplished, and of that pretious blood which he shed in it? But beside that *that redemption* and *this blood* is by the Scripture represented as pretious upon the account of its being the *redemption* and *blood of God*; be it as pretious as it otherwise could be, yet could it not make him who was but a man to become God, nor therefore procure him the honour of one. Nothing can be suppos'd to give his redemption or that Dominion which ariseth from it so great a force, but the concurrence of that other Dominion which belong'd to him as the Creator of the World, and the natural *heir* and delegate of the Father's. For therefore he obtain'd to be able to enjoin the paying himself divine honours, because he was really God that redeem'd us, and to whom as such they could not be deni'd. Again, is it not equally Divine to be able to deliver us from our Enemies, and particularly from those dreadful ones of Sin and Death? Doth not the former of these imply a power over the hearts of men, which is the peculiar priviledge of the Almighty? Is not the latter more than once<sup>i</sup> challeng'd by God unto himself, and particularly<sup>k</sup>, where it is affirm'd that *to him belong the issues from death*? But so if they be, they must be suppos'd to accrue to our Saviour upon the account of that Dominion, which belong'd to him as God, as well as of that which arose from his redemption. Lastly, was it within the compass of our Redeemer's Dominion to punish those that disobey him, and in order thereunto to call them before his Judgment Seat? But much less can this be suppos'd to have accru'd to him without the concurrence of that Dominion wherewith we have said him to be invested as the Son of God; As because the judgment of the earth is originally the Father's, so by him committed to the Son of God as such. From all which as it doth appear, that though our Saviour acquir'd a Dominion by his redemption, yet even that Dominion receiv'd a great part of its force from his natural and original one; so it appears in like manner what necessity there was that we should both establish and explain it: As by which we are not only taught what kind of honours we are to pay him, but moreover assur'd of his Ability to execute those both saving and damning powers, which belong'd to him as the Redeemer of the World.

3. Being now, according to my proposed method, to enquire *from what time* this so gracious a Dominion did *commence*, I suppose I shall not need to admonish, that it could not begin before the fall of man. For that redemption, from which it ariseth, supposing him, who is the object of it, to have been under the power of Sin and Death, neither could it be suppos'd to commence before the fall of man, because both the one and the other enter'd by it. But neither secondly, shall I need any other than barely admonish, that this Dominion whereof we speak, considered in its full latitude, did not begin till after the accomplishing of this redemption; Partly, because till then it had little or no effect upon the Gentile World, and partly, because it is manifestly to these latter days that the Prophets refer, when they speak of Gods *giving* our Saviour *the beathen for his inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for his possession*. The only difficulty in this particular is, whether our Saviour had and exercis'd this Dominion of his before his coming into the World, yea before the accomplishing of that redemption for which he came; For being grounded upon his redemption, it may seem not to have had place, before his accomplishing of it. But as nothing hindred, but God, in whom the power of sinful man was, might accord to our intended redeemer

<sup>i</sup> 1 Sam. 2. 6.

<sup>k</sup> Psa. 68. 20.

deemer the consequences of that redemption upon an assurance from him that he would in due time accomplish it; So, that our Saviour had and exercis'd, even from the fall of man, that Dominion which accrued from it, is evident both from the Old Testament and the New. For wherefore first, so early a promise of a Redeemer as that which followed immediately after the fall, and by which it was assur'd<sup>1</sup>, that *the seed of the woman should break the serpents head?* Were it not that they to whom it was first promulgated, were to reap the benefit of it, as well as those in whose time it should be more signally completed? For otherwise it would not only have been of no advantage to them, but also an addition to their grief: As being under a fear of losing the benefit of that redemption, which they foresaw would not be deny'd unto others. I demand yet farther, supposing the benefit of the forementioned promise to accrue only to late posterity, what great *proof* there could be in it of rebuke to the Devil, or of the promisers power and goodness? for so the Devils head should not have been broken, till he had involv'd more ages in destruction, than, so far as we are able to judge; are likely to be in a capacity of receiving benefit by this redeemer? I demand lastly (for even of *those words* no small advantage is to be made toward the inferring of that early Dominion which we assert) wherefore the mention of Gods *putting enmity between the woman and the serpent*, as well as between *her seed and his?* were it not, that even she, who had been thus foil'd by him, should yet enter into the lists with him, and, through the assistance of her seed, foil him? For otherwise that enmity of hers would have conduc'd more to the Serpents glory, which it is apparant this *denunciation* of God (for so it was in respect of the Serpent) was intended to abate and beat down. I demand yet farther (if the former promise may not be thought to be conclusive) why God did from time to time make a repetition of it, why he continu'd it by the means of Angels or Prophets, even till the exhibition of this Redeemer? As that too in such terms as proclaim'd an assailing from Sin and punishment; yea represented it (for so it is in the *fifty third Chapter of Isay*) as a thing already accomplished? For wherefore all this otherwise, but to create in them a vain desire of seeing that Redeemer, whom yet they should never live to see, nor reap any benefit by? To all which if we add this Son of God and our Saviours being appointed the *conductor* of the Jews<sup>m</sup>, and the command<sup>n</sup> that was given by God to them to *observe and obey* him, the many pre-significations that were then given of his future incarnation, and actions, and passion, together with the Jews impatient desire after him; and confidence in him; So we shall have little cause of doubting of his ruling then as well as now, and, though in another way, delivering them from the same evils, which we seem to be assured of as to our selves. Sure I am if the Writers of the New Testament may be judges, as which, by reason of their being Jews as well as immediately inspir'd, they may well be allow'd to be, neither can there be any doubt of this so early a benefit of our Saviours redemption, nor of that Dominion which was due to him because of it. If we enquire concerning the former of these, we have that of St. Paul<sup>a</sup> for our witness, where he tells us even concerning those *fathers*<sup>n</sup> *that were baptized into Moses, that they did all eat of the same spiritual meat with us, and did all drink of the same spiritual drink, for they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ.* For as it is evident from thence, that the whole Oeconomy of

<sup>1</sup> Gen. 3. 15.<sup>m</sup> Vid. *supra*.<sup>n</sup> 1 Cor. 10. 3, 4.

Moses

*Moses* was intended both to adumbrate and exhibit the benefits of Christ, so it is no less evident therefrom, that those benefits were alike intended for them, yea that they did intimately and plentifully partake of them. Which makes it the more strange, that men should, without any apparant necessity, endeavour to avert by a *trick* the force of those words of *St. John*, that our Saviour was a *Lamb*,  *slain from the beginning of the world*. For why might not this Lamb of God be slain in all the Sacrifices that were from the beginning offer'd up, and accordingly be participated by the offerers, as well as exhibited in and with that *Manna* which was by God poured out in the Wilderness. But neither is there less evidence from the same *St. Paul* of that Dominion which ariseth from redemption, and which, one would think, the bare presence of the benefits of that redemption should perswade. For how could the Israelites be suppos'd to *tempt Christ*, as it is by *St. Paul* plainly impli'd that they did, were it not that they were even then under the conduct of Christ, and by themselves believ'd so to be? For to go about to avert the force of this by alledging a *single Manuscript* which hath *God* instead of *Christ*, is so much the more unreasonable, because the Apostle speaks but just before of their *eating* and *drinking* of him. For why should it be any more strange to believe those Jews to have been under his Dominion, than it is that they partook of his benefits? That of the Author to the Hebrews <sup>1</sup> shall put a period to this argument, because containing a proof both of the one and the other. For how could *Moses* bear the *reproach of Christ* by *suffering afflictions with the people of God*, but that they were Christs people as well as Gods? Or set such a value on it with respect to the recompence of reward, but that he look'd for that recompence from the hands of him for whom he so suffered reproach? All which things I have insisted the longer on, as to vindicate an old Catholick truth, so to vindicate together with it the honour of this our Lord and Redeemer, as who hath been such ever since Mankind stood in need of his assistance.

4. I will not stand long to shew, of *what continuance* this Dominion shall be, because we learn from the nature of the thing it self, as well as <sup>1</sup> *I Cor. 15. 25.* from the doctrine of *St. Paul*, that, *considered in its present circumstances*, it shall continue but till it hath *subdued all the enemies* thereof, and brought us to God and to his glory. Only as nothing hinders his retaining so much of it as may be consistent with that State, if it were but for a trophée of his former Victory, and a monument of his former pains and travel; so I see not how we can well avoid the attributing it to him, if we consider what is said concerning the *everlastingness* thereof, or that *comprecation* which we find made to him by the united powers of Heaven and Earth. For thus for the former we are told, that this Dominion or Kingdom is *so everlasting* that there shall be *no end* thereof, nor shall it receive any period either <sup>1</sup> by its own *passing away* or the *destruction* of others: For the latter, that when the Angels in the *Revelations* said with a loud voice, *Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power and riches, &c.* the whole Creation made answer <sup>2</sup>, *Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb for ever and ever.* For as it is not possible to find out words which are more expressive than the former of these, to denote an *absolute* and *never-failing* eternity; So who can think they intended or believed *any other power*, who in the very same breath and in the very same words wherein they express their desire, as *to him that sitteth upon the throne*, pray

<sup>1</sup> Luk. 1. 33.

<sup>2</sup> Dan. 7. 14.

<sup>1</sup> Rev. 5. 13.



pray that *Blessing, and honour, and power, be unto the Lamb for ever and ever.* However it be, which will then best be known when we shall come to be *for ever* <sup>with this our Lord,</sup> most certain it is that this Dominion of his is of *present force* <sup>virtue,</sup> and is as sure to continue as long as *our* for ever here: And if so, there will be as lasting an obligation upon us to acknowledge it, I do not say only by saying *Lord Lord,* which we know before-hand from this Lord of ours <sup>Mat. 7. 21.</sup>, how it will at last be accepted, but by a hearty adoration and sincere obedience, by fearing to offend him in consideration of his future judgment, and trusting upon him for those more gracious expresses of his power which he hath promised to bestow upon those who shall continue faithful in his service.

---

## **Which was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.**

---

### **The Contents.**

*Of the person who is here affirm'd to be conceiv'd and born, which is shewn out of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be no other than God the Son; to which is also added a proof out of the writings of the Sibyls. A transition from thence to the consideration of his Conception and birth, where enquiry is first of all made what nature he assum'd by it, which is also shewn both by general and particular proofs to be no other than humane. Enquiry is next made, after what manner he did assume it; as that too, with reference to the nature assum'd, and to the nature or person assuming. In answer to the former whereof is shewn that he assum'd a humane nature without any personal subsistence, as to the latter, that he took that nature into the unity of his divine person, and the consequences of that Assumption declar'd. Which done enquiry is made thirdly, by what means he did assume it: Where after an account of the respective interests of the Virgin Mary, and of the Holy Ghost in his Conception, consideration is had of his birth of the Virgin Mary, and therein shewn first, that our Saviour was so born, and not only the objections against it answered, but at large declared also in what sense we are to look upon Joseph as his Father, and the reason of the Evangelists deducing his Pedigree rather by Joseph than the Virgin. It is shewn secondly from the Prophecies of the Old Testament, that the Messiah was so to be born, and that of Jeremy 31. 32. particularly explain'd and vindicated. As thirdly, what the reasons of this miraculous conception and birth were. A conclusion of the whole with an enquiry concerning the ends of this Son of Gods assuming an humane nature, and the propriety thereof toward the compassing of those ends noted.*

**P***ericulosum est de Deo etiam vera dicere*, it is a dangerous thing, said one, to speak even that which is true of God, and they, who consider the immenseness of his nature, will easily subscribe to the truth of it. And yet I may truly say, I am fallen upon a more dangerous subject, even that Gods becoming incarnate. For now I am not only to consider of an infinite nature, which our reason can only grope after, but to reconcile a finite one to it, which our reason doth not only not comprehend, but seem to disavow. Here only is our comfort, that we have, beside the word of God, a signal direction from the Church, which, by occasion of the several heresies that sprung up about it, and by which (as

<sup>a</sup> *Ecl. Polit. l.*  
<sup>3.</sup> *Sect. 52.*

*Hooker* observes) it was molested for well nigh five hundred years, hath sifted it to the bottom, and given us a particular account concerning it. For thus first that Creed, which our *Communion service* presents us with, and which, as it was intended for a general explication of this, so hath furnished us with no contemptible explication of the present Article: That giving us to understand, that *he*, whom we before describ'd, for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man. To the same purpose, though yet more particularly both as to the manner and consequences of this incarnation, doth that of *St. Athanasius*, or who ever was the Author of it, discourse, where it professeth to deliver the right faith concerning it; The purport thereof being, that our Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God, is God and man; God of the substance of the father begotten before the worlds, and man of the substance of his mother born in the world; Perfect God, and perfect man, of a reasonable soul and humane flesh subsisting; and yet though God and man, not two but one Christ, as that again, not by any conversion or confusson, but by taking the manhood into God, yea into the unity of his person. And indeed however our own Creed take notice only of his being conceiv'd and born, without specifying at all in what nature he was so, and much less all the particularities before describ'd; Yet, as it sufficiently intimates the nature assum'd to have been a humane one, because she of whom he was born was of it, so it contains in it the seeds of all those things which both in the one and the other Creed are more distinctly affirm'd. For the evidencing whereof I will consider,

1. Of the person which is here said to have been conceiv'd and born; and then,
2. Of his conception and birth.

I.

As to the former of these all the Creeds agree, that it was no other than the Son of God, even he, who (as one of them express'd it) did by that Sonship obtain to be God of God, and God of the substance of his father as the other; Though had they not been so careful to subjoin this character of his person, it would not have been at all difficult to infer it: They who affirm Jesus Christ to have been thus conceiv'd and born, supposing the Son of God to have been so, because he was no less God, and the Son of God than man. Agreeable hereto is the doctrine of the Scripture, whether you consider the person here spoken of as God, or as God the

<sup>a</sup> *1 Tim. 3. 16.*

Son. For thus for the former we are told, that it was God that was manifest in the flesh, and that he who came in the flesh, even Christ, was over all God blessed for ever; and no wonder, when we find no mean footsteps thereof even in the writings of the Jews, yea in those which

<sup>b</sup> *Rom. 9. 5.*

were

were the proper portion of the heathen, I mean the Sibyls. For who, that is not strangely unreasonable, can deny that to be a pregnant testimony of it, which fell from Eve upon occasion of the birth of Cain? For as, after so signal a promise from God of her Seeds bruising the Serpents head, it is not unreasonable to think she might entertain a conceit of this first seed of hers being the person; so agreeably to that conception, and to what the Divinity of the work suggested to her, she is brought in by Moses affirming that she had gotten a man the Lord. Plainly intimating thereby a belief of the promised seed being also God, and that he it was who was to be made man for our redemption. Only, if any man be unsatisfied with that rendring of the words, because different both from our own and others, let him know that it is not only the most natural one, and acknowledged so to be even by those who do most oppose it, as Helvicus hath shewn at large; but it stands yet farther confirmed to us, as the same Learned man hath observ'd, from one of the Chaldee Paraphrasists: He representing the person born as an *Angel of the Lord*, which we know from the Prophet *Malachi* to have been a Periphrasis of the Messiah. From the writings of the Jews pass we to those of the Sibyls, and particularly to that of them which is remembered by *Virgil*, and of the genuineness whereof therefore no reasonable doubt can be. For who is there that reads it, and can withal forbear to call to mind that foregoing Article of the *Constantinopolitan Creed*? For as there, after the mention of his being *God of God*, it is added concerning Christ, that for us men and for our salvation he came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man; in like manner, and as near to it as we can suppose a Heathen Poet capable of expressing it, we find the *Sibylla Cumæa* prophesying of this God incarnate: Now doth both the Virgin return and the Kingdom of Saturn. Now is a new birth sent down from the high heaven; as a little after, that he should receive the life of the Gods, and see Heroes mix'd with Gods and be seen by them. And all this, as is expressed in the intermediate verses, to loose the earth from that continued fear which they conceiv'd by reason of their sins. Which as it is but so many other words for, for us men and for our salvation, so the other that this deliverer should be a compound of heroes and gods, and that this new birth should descend from heaven. For so it is not at all incongruous to believe, that, when God design'd to call the Gentile world to the acknowledgment of our Saviour, he should furnish them with some Prophecies whether mediately or immediately inspired by himself, the better to fit them, when time came, for the reception of him. And had those Prophecies of theirs been transmitted to us without either the glosses or interpolations of busy men, I should not much doubt, even by this, that we should have found other pregnant attestations to this and other great truths of our Religion. But because in the Godhead there are three persons, and all the Creeds affirm it to be the second person or the Son who was thus conceiv'd and born; therefore, for the more full manifestation of the person, we must go on to shew it to have been the Son, which a very slender insight into the Scriptures will enable us to do. For who knows not that that Word, concerning whose glory St. John affirms, that they beheld it as the glory of the only begotten of the father, that he, I say, was made flesh, and

Gen. 4. 1.

Desiderium  
matris Evæ.  
Ibid.

Mal. 3. 1.

Ecolg. 4. seu  
Pollio.

<sup>1</sup> Jam redit & Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna,  
Jam nova progenies cœli demittatur alto.

<sup>2</sup> Ille deum vitam accipiet, hunc viderimus  
Permissos heroes, & ipse videbitur illis.

<sup>3</sup> Te duce, siqua manent sceleris vestigia nostri,  
Irrita perpetua solvent formidine terras.



\* Gal. 4. 4.

*dwelt among us*, as in like manner, that *when the fulness of time was come God sent forth his Son made of a Woman?* Which yet is no more than what the Old Testament will be found to affirm, if we compare the several Scriptures thereof together; it being affirm'd by several of them that this Messiah was to be the Lord *Jehovah*, but by the second *Psalme* more particularly, that he was to be his *Son*, even that Son whom he had *begotten* in his own infinite essence.

II.

Being now, as you see, abundantly satisfi'd concerning the *person* of him, who is here affirm'd to have been conceiv'd and born, we are in the next place to reflect upon that his *conception* and *birth*; Where again, because conception and birth supposeth the assumption of another nature, we will enquire,

1. What that nature was.
2. After what manner he assum'd it to himself.
3. Which is the thing the Article doth more directly import, By what means he did so assume it.
4. And lastly, for what end.

I. What the nature he assum'd was, none of the Creeds suffer us to doubt, no not that which doth in truth give the most imperfect account of it; *Our own*, though it do not, like the other, express a humane one, yet sufficiently implying it, when it affirms him to have been *born of her* who undoubtedly was of it, yea moreover (for so it follows in the Creed) to have *suffered* and *died*. For well may he, notwithstanding his *conception by the Holy Ghost*, be suppos'd to have followed the worse nature, who assum'd also a suffering and mortal one. So evident is it even from the *Creed*, that this Son of God assum'd a humane nature, and that, as he was born of a humane Creature, so he took no other being from her: But how much more then from the Scripture, if we consider either its appellations, or its attributing to him those several parts which constitute it? For how often doth the Scripture, yea he himself give himself the title of *Son of man*, which in the *Hebrew idiom* denotes a man of the meaner sort, and how much more then one who was not without the nature of one? How often doth the same Scripture give him the title of *Man*, yea even, when it attributes the most glorious effects unto him? It being by the *one man* Jesus Christ that St. Paul affirms *the grace of God and the gift by grace to have abounded unto many*; as by the same *man* again that *the resurrection of the dead came*; In fine, that as there is but *one Mediator between God and man*, so that Mediator is no other than the *man* Christ Jesus. For how improperly as well as falsely had this title been bestow'd upon him, were it not to represent in this weak nature the greatness of that divine power by which so great things were accomplished? And though I will not say it will be as impossible to elude the force of those Texts wherein this *Word* is said to have been *made flesh*, to have been *manifest in the flesh*, or *come in it*, which are expressions that are frequently made use of; Yet they who consider the force of that expression in the *Hebrew idiom* will not easily allow of any other sense of it. For how often do the Hebrews make use of it, to denote a humane nature, or rather those persons that are of it? For thus in one place *all flesh*, that is to say all men, are said to have *corrupted their way upon the earth*, and *Who is there of all flesh*, said the Israelites in another, *that hath heard the voice of the living God speaking out of the midst of the fire as we have, and lived?* O thou that hearest prayer, faith

\* Vid. Eret. in  
Mat. 8. 20.

\* Rom. 3. 15.

\* 1 Cor. 15. 21.

\* 1 Tim. 2. 5.

\* Gen. 6. 12.

\* Deut. 5. 26.

saith the Psalmist <sup>a</sup>, *unto thee shall all flesh come*, so to sue to thee and <sup>a</sup> Psal. 63. 2. adore thee; And, *All flesh*, saith God by the Prophet *Isay* <sup>a</sup>, *shall come* <sup>a</sup> Isa. 66. 23. to worship before me. In fine, that we may see the same *idiome* to have past out of the Old Testament into the New, thus also St. Paul <sup>a</sup>, *There-* <sup>a</sup> Rom. 3. 20. *fore by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in Gods sight*: There being no place for understanding these expressions either of unreasonable Creatures, or of a flesh that is not also endued with a humane Spirit. However it be, those expressions will serve us both for an inlet into, and a considerable part of those proofs which attribute to our Saviour the constituent parts of humane nature. For if, as was before observ'd, this *Word was made flesh*, and manifest in it, *if Christ, as concerning the flesh, came from the fathers* <sup>a</sup>, and *because the children were partakers of* <sup>a</sup> Rom. 9. 3. *flesh and blood* <sup>a</sup>, he also took part of it; if, as was but just now intimated from that of St. Paul, *he deriv'd his pedigree from those fathers* <sup>a</sup> Heb. 2. 14. who were certainly *flesh*, if he were *the seed of the woman*, and of *Abraham and David*, then did he assume so much of the form of a man as the exterior part of him, because they from whom he deriv'd his flesh were undoubtedly so. And indeed as there were never any who deny'd our Saviour a humane body who were willing to allow him a real one, so it would be as hard to believe, did not the story of the Church assure us of it, that there ever should have been those who question'd the reality of his. For what may be thought to be a real body, if that which is compos'd of *flesh and blood* is not? Especially when it gave proof of its being so by sweating, and bleeding, and dying, as after that (and when there was more danger of Phantasticalness) by offering it self to the touch of those that question'd it. Had those Ancient Hereticks, who thus denied his coming in the flesh, felt the half of that in *theirs* which he endur'd in *his*, they would have learn'd by those their own sufferings rather to acknowledge *his* with the highest thankfulness, than gone about to question the reality of *his body* or *them*. Of far greater necessity, because question'd by a more considerable Heretick <sup>b</sup>, is the proof of Christs <sup>b</sup> Apollinarists having a *humane Spirit*, as well as either a living or humane body. Though he must be a great stranger to the Scripture, or at least a very superficial considerer of it, to whom such proofs as these had need to be suggested. For not to say, that the title of man was otherwise very improperly bestow'd upon him, because it is that *better part* of us which constitutes us such; who is there that hath never read of his *commending his spirit* <sup>c</sup> at the last gasp *into the hands of God*, or, after he hath so, <sup>c</sup> Luk. 23. 46. can doubt of his being endu'd with *one*? Even such a one as might be thought to survive the body, and could not therefore be any *animal* one, but which yet stood in need of commendation, and could not therefore be *divine*. Who is there that hath not heard of that which is one of the principal faculties of it, even his *understanding* <sup>d</sup>, nay who is there that <sup>d</sup> Luk. 2. 47. hath not heard of that *understandings growing* <sup>e</sup> in wisdom, which <sup>e</sup> Ibid.—52. shews it to be no *divine* one? Who can be ignorant of his praying that *not his will* <sup>f</sup> but *Gods might be done*, but he must know withal that he <sup>f</sup> — 22. 42. had a *will* as well as an *understanding*, yea such a one, as could carry him to desire that which Gods will might not, and could not therefore be any other than humane? In fine, who is there that hath not heard of his *passions* as well as will, of his *anger* <sup>g</sup> at those who watch'd him whether <sup>g</sup> Mar. 3. 5. he would heal a man that had a withered hand on the Sabbath day, of his <sup>h</sup> Luk. 19. 41. *weeping* <sup>h</sup> Mat. 26. 38. over *Jerusalem*, and extreme *grief* <sup>i</sup> at his own Agony? For <sup>i</sup> these

these shew him also to have been a man of *like passions* with our selves; as in truth unlike us in nothing but in our sins. For what can be thought to be wanting of a humane nature, where there is both the better and worser part of it; as of the better part again, what is farthest removed from the worser, as the *understanding* and *will*, as well as what is most of kin to it, his *affections*.

II. Now as after I have shewn *what nature, it was* our Saviour assumed, it may be but reasonable to enquire *after what manner he assumed it*; so to return a more distinct as well as fuller answer to it, it will be but requisite to consider this *Assumption* both with reference to the *nature assumed*, and to that *Nature or person rather which did assume it*.

If we consider it with reference to the former of these, so it will not be amiss to observe, that it had for its *object* indeed a *humane nature*, but *without any personal subsistence*. For beside that such an assumption seems most agreeable to that end which the Son of God propos'd to himself in it (for how could *Wisdom*, as *Hooker*<sup>\*</sup> observes, being not to save *this* or *that person*, but *many*, build her house more advantageously than of *that nature* which was alike common unto them all) if the Son of God had taken to himself a nature already subsisting, there must necessarily, because he was a person before, have been in him not one person but more, which, as I shall by and by shew, our Religion forbids us to believe. And although it may seem hard (though who can wonder to find mysteries so?) to believe the assumption of a real nature without any personal subsistence; yet will even that cease to be so, if we allow of what the Judicious *Hooker*<sup>1</sup> observes, and which in truth contains nothing at all of inconvenient in it. For supposing this Son of God to have united himself to it, at the same instant wherein it was made, and it will also follow, that he took it before it could have any other subsistence than what it receiv'd by being united to himself. As indeed, how otherwise could the Son of God have been said to be *conceiv'd*, as the *Creed* obligeth us to believe?

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*

But because, when question is made concerning the manner of this assumption, a principal regard is always had to the person that did assume it; therefore to give what satisfaction therein either the *Creeds* or the *Scriptures* will afford, I will address my self to the resolution of it. Where first I will shew that the Son of God so took it,

1. As to make it one with him.

2. As to make it one with him in person.

1. Of the first of these little doubt can be made either from the *Creed* or the *Scriptures*; Nay on the contrary they oblige us to acknowledge it. For beside that the *Creed* represents the same Jesus Christ both as the only Son of God and the Son of a Virgin; those *Creeds* which the *Greek Church* professed, and which as to that particular were never faulted by any, prompt us expressly to believe <sup>m</sup> *in one Lord Jesus Christ*, as well as *in one God* the Father. As express, if not more, are the declarations of the *Scripture*, and by which we must of necessity be bound up, if we will not be by the other: Because assuring us, that, as there is but *one God* the father of whom are all things, so there is but one <sup>n</sup> *Lord Jesus Christ by whom are all things*; As again, not two Mediators <sup>o</sup> *between God and man*, but *one mediator*, even the man Jesus Christ.

<sup>m</sup> *Ruffin. Expof. in Symbol.*

<sup>n</sup> *1 Cor. 8. 6.*

<sup>o</sup> *1 Tim. 2. 5.*

2. But neither will there be less evidence of the Son of God's making it

it



it one with him in person, than there is of his making it one with him at all: As will appear if we can discharge all other sorts of *unity*, or give a sure establishment to this. For shall we affirm the humane nature to become one with this son of God as to his own? But so we cannot do without either a confusion or conversion of the natures, both which are repugnant to reason and Scripture. For what confusion of natures can we imagine there where one of them because divine cannot receive any change, as all mixed substances must be suppos'd to do? Or what conversion of natures, where the same divine nature cannot cease to be what it was, and therefore neither be converted into a humane one; nor because it is also perfect receive any addition from it? Shall we then say, and other than that we cannot say unless we admit of a unity of person, that this Son of God and the humane nature became one by a meer apposition or contact? But beside that *that* is one of the lowest sort of unities, and which therefore is not to be predicated of that which I shall by and by shew to be a most intimate one; For the *word* to become or be made *flesh*, as St. *John*, and to be *conceiv'd and born*, as the *Creed* affirms, imports a much more intimate union than what ariseth from meer contact or apposition. From whence as it is easy to collect, that the Son of God and the humane nature became one person, or rather that the Son of God assum'd it into the unity of his; So it stands yet farther confirmed to us by that resemblance, which *Athanasius* makes use of, of Soul and bodies becoming one person, and which, so far as great and small things may be compar'd together, is an apposite and accurate one. For as by virtue of that union which is between them, we come so far to partake of both their qualities, that we both are and may be said to be both *spirit* and *flesh*; so by virtue of that union which the Incarnation produceth, the person of Jesus Christ became God and man, of an infinite and eternal, as well as of a finite and created nature. Again, as by virtue of the former union we come so far to partake of their faculties, that we are no less enabled to reason and discourse notwithstanding the grossness of our bodies, than we are able to perform corporeal actions notwithstanding the spirituality of the other; so there is the like communication in the person of Christ, of the powers of the divine and humane nature by virtue of that union which the incarnation made. For thus notwithstanding the divine nature, the person of Christ did eat and drink like us, as again notwithstanding his humane discover the very thoughts of those who could easily conceal their conceptions from the knowledge of the other. Only as in all likenesses we must remember there are also differences, for otherwise they would not be like but the same; So this especially is not to be forgotten, that whereas the Soul, the principal part of our composition, seems to have had no subsistence before its union to the body, and so both concur alike to that personal union that afterwards ariseth, the Son of God, because subsisting from all eternity, must be thought to have given the humane nature that subsistence which it had, yea taken it into the unity of his own. Which unity is yet so strait, that I know not whether I can find any thing in the foremention'd resemblance, which may *only adumbrate* this farther account which the Scripture gives us concerning it. For thus we find our Saviour himself, when speaking of himself under the notion of the *son of man*, yet affirming himself <sup>to have</sup> *to have* <sup>Joh. 3. 13.</sup> *come down from heaven*, yea *to be in heaven* at that very moment; As on the other side St. *Paul*, where he speaks of him as *God*, that he had *purchas-*

<sup>1</sup> Act. 20. 28. *purchased his Church by his own blood*, even by that blood which was proper to his humane nature, and which the Author to the *Hebrews* makes use of to prove him to have *partaken* of our nature. Not that it appertains to the *Son of man*, as *such*, either to *have come down from heaven* or to *have been in heaven* whilst he was upon earth, nor yet to the *Son of God* to have *blood like us*; But that as he who is the *Son of man* is also *God*, and he who is *God* is also the *Son of man*, so there is such an intimate connexion between the person of the Son of God and our humane nature, that what is *one's* is also the *other's* by vertue of it.

<sup>1</sup> Heb. 2. 14. This is *without controversie a great mysterie*, so *St. Paul* tells us concerning it, and so we shall be sure to find it, if we do more nearly consider it; But as for that reason I shall forbear to say any thing more concerning it, so I could not but say thus much, because a mystery of our Religion and of the *Creed*, and because, as the same *St. Paul* tells us, it is also a mystery of *godliness*. It is a *mystery of godliness* as it prompts us to godly actions, it is a mystery of *Godliness* too, because encouraging us to the practice of them. Only because this latter consideration of it will of necessity be brought before us when we come to reflect upon those gracious *ends* for which he thus assum'd our nature, it shall suffice me at present to remark as to the other, that it prompts us to adore and magnifie the Son of God for thus assuming to himself our mortal nature, yea it prompts us to adore the person of him in whom both those natures concentred, even the *God-man* Christ Jesus. In fine, for I will not now extend my discourse beyond those godly actions which are direct and immediate consecratories thereof, it prompts us to yield to him a ready obedience in all things, because enabled by this mysterious union to command; it prompts us the rather so to do, because stooping to that union for our advantage.

III. We have dwelt hitherto upon that which is rather impli'd than expressed, though no doubt the principal intendment of the Article, and a principal part of our belief; I come now to that, which is more particularly express'd, even *the means by which the Son of God assum'd to himself our humane nature*; Where first I shall entreat of his being *conceiv'd by the Holy Ghost*, and then of his being *born of the Virgin Mary*.

It is not unknown to those who have look'd into *Ruffinus* his *Exposition of the Creed*, that the Ancient ones read *" born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary*, so making both the one and the other the principles of that production which we are now upon the consideration of. The *Creed*, as you see, hath now alter'd the expression, though I think not at all to the prejudice of its intendment, but rather to the more clear declaration of it. For as it rightly enough restrains the birth of our Saviour to his Mother, because there doth not appear any concurrence of the Holy Ghost to it, nor yet any necessity of it: so it sufficiently intimates her interest in the first production or conception of him; Conception as such being the proper part of the Mother, by vertue of whatsoever being it comes to be accomplished. Only before I come to shew, what the particular interest of these two principles were, to which this Conception is ascrib'd, I think it but just to reflect upon this conception in its more *general intendment*, and as the means by which we all come to be what we are, and the Son of God took our nature to him.

It had been of old affirm'd in that first Prophecy concerning the Messiah, that *the seed of the woman* should bruise the *Serpent's head*; and so persuaded

<sup>1</sup> Qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine.  
Ruffin. Expos. in Symbol.

swaded was she to whom it was first made of the truth of it, that no sooner did she bring forth a Son but she apprehended him to be the person, and that this her first seed was the promised one. How much she was deceiv'd as to the application of it, the event shewed, and the more explicit account that was afterwards given concerning the quality of that woman whose the *promised seed* was to be. But that she was not deceiv'd as to the Messiah's being the *seed of a woman*, the Prophecy that came after shews; that giving us to understand that one of that Sex, though a *Virgin*, should in due time *conceive and bring him forth*. In conformity to which Prophecy, as we find the Angel *Gabriel* telling the *Virgin Mary* that *she should conceive in her womb, and bring forth a Son*, so *St. Matthew* instructs us that in her was *fulfill'd* that which *Isay* had so Prophefied; as *St. Luke* that he was *conceiv'd in her womb*, and *Elizabeth* that he was *the fruit of it*. For which cause in the very next verse she calls the *Virgin Mary* the *mother of our Lord*, and both *blesseth* her and God for making her so. Now as supposing the premises it is easy to infer, that, how extraordinary soever the persons were that concurr'd to this production, yet the production it self was not; our Saviour how great soever passing through the ordinary stages that other men do to the attaining of his humane nature: So it behooved him to do so, as to comply with the Prophecies which had so foretold, so also to give a *more full proof to the truth of his humane nature, for his own greater humiliation, and the clearer manifestation of Gods glory*. For was it at all unknown either to God or him, that the truth of that his nature should be call'd in question? Was it unknown to him, that his own future works might confirm men in that suspicion, because not so agreeable to the weakness of that nature in which he appeared? And could it then be other than requisite, that that nature of his should be well attested, nay would not the want of *this testimony* have some way prejudic'd men against the rest? For having known no other production but by the conception of a woman, it is easy to see they would not have been very forward to approve of any other, and either look'd upon him therefore as an Impostor for representing himself as otherwise born, or question'd the truth of his humanity because of it. I demand secondly, was it not the design of this Son of God to humble himself by assuming our nature, nay did not a great part of the meritoriousness thereof consist in the humiliation of him? And could that better appear than by conforming, as much as might be, to the laws of human births, and becoming like us in the meannells of our beginnings, as well as in the weakness of our natural frame? But then if we moreover consider, how expedient this way of production was for the manifestation of Gods glory in that work which was to be done by him, so we shall see reason enough, I do not say only to believe it, but allow of it as just and prudent. For *neither*, as *Irenæus* speaks, could the Devil have been so justly overcome, unless he who overcame him, had been the Son of a woman, because it was by a woman that he came to domineer over us. and whom therefore it was but requisite to make use of to render the victory so much the more compleat.

Having given this general account of the conception of our Saviour together with the behooffulness thereof, enquire we in the next place what the *particular interests* of those persons were whom we have before affirmed to concur to it. Now as the *Holy Ghost*, to be sure, hath both the first and chiefest, and ought therefore to have the precedency in our

<sup>1</sup> Gen. 4. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Isa. 7. 14.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Luc. 1. 31.

<sup>5</sup> Mat. 1. 22, 23.

<sup>6</sup> Luc. 2. 21.

<sup>7</sup> Luc. 1. 42.

<sup>8</sup> Adv. her. li.

<sup>9</sup> 5. c. 21. Neq;

enim iuste vi-

ctus fuisset ini-

micus, nisi ex

muliere homo

esset, qui vicit

eum. Per mu-

liorem enim ho-

mini domina-

tus est ab initio,

semetipsum con-

trarium statuens

homini.



<sup>1</sup>Mat. 1. 20.

discourse, so I shall not doubt to affirm *his* to approach *nearest* to that of a *Father*, and ought accordingly to be so look'd upon by us. For beside that there is not any to ascribe that part to, unless we will ascribe it unto him, that one saying of the Angel to *Joseph*, when he entertain'd thoughts of putting away the Virgin *Mary* may satisfy any reasonable man concerning it. *Fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife, for that which is conceived, or rather begotten in her* (for so it is in the Greek) *is of the Holy Ghost*. For being the proper signification of the Greek word *γεννηται* is to beget, and accordingly in that very chapter, where this is affirm'd, frequently set to denote *the act of a father* in the production of a child, being that begetting was undoubtedly the thing at which *Joseph* was concern'd, and to which therefore we are to suppose the words of the Angel to contain a direct answer; it is but reasonable to think, when that begetting is entitl'd to the Holy Ghost, that we ought to look upon that concurrence of his as most like that of a *Father*, and to whom a proper begetting doth belong; Especially, when with reference to this concurrence of the Holy Ghost, it is elsewhere <sup>2</sup> so distinctly affirm'd, that *that holy thing which should so be begotten* (for the same word is still us'd in the Greek) *should be called the son of God*. Only, as when I affirm'd the part of the Holy Ghost to approach nearest to that of a *Father*, I must consequently be supposed to intend that it is not strictly and properly such; so there is this reason to oblige us so to think, that our Saviour took none of his substance from him: It being the distinct affirmation of *St. Paul*, that *as concerning the flesh* Christ came from the *Fathers*, and consequently deriv'd no part of it from the other. But as setting that aside I know no reason to deny him a kind of *Paternity*, because undoubtedly contributing so far to the production of our Saviour, as to enable the Virgin *Mary* to conceive him of her own substance; so what was wanting to the Holy Ghost as to a communication of substance was abundantly supplied by that holiness which he infus'd into him at the same time he overshadowed his Mother: That *holy thing* which was in him being so of the Holy Ghost, that he cannot be suppos'd to have had any partner in it.

<sup>1</sup>Luc. 1. 35.

<sup>1</sup>Rom. 9. 5.

<sup>1</sup>Luc. 1. 43.

I will not now say much, because that is competently evident from the premises, what the interest of the Virgin *Mary* was in that conception whereof we speak. For first both the title of *Mother* <sup>2</sup> and the attributing of that *conception* and the *fruit* of it *to her womb*, shews her to have had at least as great an interest in it as other Mothers have in the production of their Children. But neither is it less evident from the Holy Ghosts communicating nothing to our Saviour of his flesh, that the Virgin *Mary* did so far transcend all other Mothers, that she conceived him purely of her own: What is denied of the Holy Ghost being to be suppos'd to have been supplied by her, though we had no other evidence of it. And though that be a thing not so commonly taken notice of, and it may be too whether through inadvertency or prejudice deny'd, yet must it be granted thirdly, that in this also she transcend'd the ordinary sort of mothers, that her own *faith* was not without its instrumentality in this conception. For beside that it is no new thing for holy women thus to conceive, for so we read that *Sarah* conceived <sup>1</sup> that *Isaac* of whom the promised Seed was to be; beside, that it is competently evident from a saying of the Scripture <sup>2</sup> that Miracles cannot well be wrought where there is not a suitable belief in the persons who are concern'd in them;

<sup>1</sup>Heb. 11. 11.

<sup>2</sup>Mark 6. 5, 6.

them; What other can we make of that address of *Elizabeth* to her, *And blessed is she that believed, for there shall be a performance of those things which were told her from the Lord*; That expression plainly implying her faith of the Angels Message both to be a ground of her own blessedness, and a *medium* whereby ours was to be procur'd. Sure I am that ancient and Holy Father *Irenaeus* did not only make that interpretation of it, but represented it moreover, as it did well deserve, as a farther proof of the compleatness of that Victory which we obtain over the Devil through her Seed. For *so* also, said he <sup>3. c. 33. Sic autem & Eva inobedientia uos dus solutionem accepit per obedientiam Mariae. Quod enim alligavit Virgo Eva per incredulitatem, hoc Virgo Maria solvit per fidem.</sup>, *did the knot of the disobedience of Eve receive a solution by the obedience of Mary. For what the Virgin Eve bound by her incredulity, that the Virgin Mary loos'd by her faith*; even by that faith by which she conceiv'd in her Womb the great Redeemer of the world, and by whom it is that we are loosed from our bonds. Upon which account it is also to be said; that she ought not only to be had in honour, upon the account of Gods making use of her Womb for the Conception of our Lord, and for which she herself affirms <sup>Luc. 1. 48.</sup>, that *all generations should call her blessed*; but upon the account also of her faith by which she was enabled to conceive him. Which, though it will not justify those exorbitant honours which are given to her by the Papists, and which sober men among themselves have been ashamed of, yet will justify us in esteeming of her as a glorious instrument of God in bringing about his own gracious purposes. For if as the Author to the Hebrews observes, all those who were so exemplary for their faith, and particularly the mother of *Isaac*, who was but a type of the promised seed, obtained a good report through faith; how much more ought she who by her faith conceived the promised seed itself, the Saviour of her self and of the world? But from hence we may also collect, how unreasonably that of our Saviour is alledg'd against this good report, which was return'd by him to a woman, who upon occasion of his gracious words cryed out <sup>Luc. 11. 27.</sup>, *Blessed is the womb that bare thee and the paps that thou hast sucked*. For as the utmost that answer of his imports is, that it is a much more blessed thing to conceive Christ in our heart than simply to conceive him in a Womb; so it doth not only make nothing at all against the due honour of this Conception, but rather give a more sure establishment to it: Because this conception was a conception of her heart as well as of her womb, a conception by faith as well as a fleshly one.

Of our Saviours conception by the Holy Ghost, as that is considered abstractedly both from his birth, and the quality of that person in whose womb he was conceiv'd, what hath been said may suffice. Proceed we now to consider of his being born of the Virgin Mary, where, conformably to those words of the Creed, which I am now to entreat of, I will shew,

1. That our Saviour was thus born.

2. That so it was foretold the Messiah should be.

3. Point out the reasons of that conception and birth.

1. That our Saviour was born of a Virgin; and of the Virgin Mary, *St. Matthew* plainly shews; where, after an account of his birth, he applies to him that Prophecy of *Isay* wherein it is affirm'd, that a Virgin should be with child and bring forth a Son. But will be farther confirm'd by what the context declares concerning her. For lest any man should surmise her to be a Virgin in name rather than in truth when she went with the Saviour of the World, the same *St. Matthew* tells us expressly,



\* Mat. 1. 25.

\* Mat. 1. 20.

\* Trin. adv. her.

\* 1. 6. 24.

\* 1. 6. 25.

pressly, that Joseph had not then known her, for it was before they came together, saith that Evangelist, that she was found to be with child, and again, He knew her not till she had brought forth her first born Son, even him who had afterwards the name of Jesus. But neither had any other man known her, as Joseph's fears sometime misgave him. For an Angel was sent from Heaven to assure Joseph and in him us, that that which was conceived or begotten in her was of the Holy Ghost. Which most plain and convincing Texts as oft as I reflect upon, I cannot but wonder that out of Jury there could be found any that should oppose themselves, and Christianity it self afford some who should affirm him to be Joseph's Son as well as Marie's, as we read Carpocrates \* and Cerinthus \* did of old. Not but that this truth is encumbered with some difficulties, yea such as the Scriptures themselves as well as our own reason may suggest; but that so plain and distinct affirmations may well be thought to outweigh them all, and prompt men rather to distrust their own reason and judgment, than deny what is so distinctly declar'd. Though if we will more nearly approach those difficulties, I doubt not but we shall find they may fairly enough be solv'd, without either the denying or questioning of the other.

\* Luc. 2. 48.

\* Luc. 2. 51.

To begin with those difficulties which the Scriptures do suggest, and which, because the Scripture's, seem to me to be most material. For not only do two of the Evangelists draw down his descent from David by the Pedigree of his supposed Father Joseph, but St. Luke bring in the Virgin Mary her self interrogating him, why he would give such occasion of grief to her and to his father, as, without their knowledge to absent himself so long from them; And, which is more, that Saviour of ours, after he had apologiz'd for that act of his by its being done in obedience to his heavenly one, acknowledging even this his earthly Parent \* by the subjection and obedience he afterwards paid him in common with his Mother. For by what ever title this his Mothers Husband came to be his Father, these things shew him plainly enough to have been more than a supposed one, as whose lineage is made use of to link him to the Royal stock of David, yea who appears to have had the Authority of a father over him, as that Authority again, both acknowledg'd and obey'd by him. But as those Scriptures which do either intimate or affirm Joseph to be his Father, do no where represent him such by a natural generation, which is the only thing that can incommode his being conceiv'd and born of a Virgin; so to take away all pretence of his being so the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, I will make it my business to shew,

1. That the relation and Authority of a Father might accrue to him by the espousing of his Virgin Mother.

2. That the privileges of the Royal stock might be derived upon our Saviour by being thus taken into Joseph's Family.

1. That the relation and authority of a Father might accrue to Joseph by the espousing of his Virgin Mother, cannot seem strange to any that shall consider the condition the woman enters into upon her espousals. For from that time she becomes, as it were, a subject to another; and that is more especially true of her, when married, which St. Paul hath affirm'd of both parties, that she hath not power over her own body but her husband. And if so, the off-spring of her body will fall under his Dominion, and follow the condition of its Parents. For thus by the laws of God as well as those of men, what a servant doth bring forth, as well as what she

\* 1 Cor. 7. 4.

\* Gen. 17. 23.



she doth acquire, falls under the dominion of him to whom she doth so belong, and her Children are no less *his* than her possessions. Now as the Child of a servant doth by that subjection of hers become no less a servant to her Master than her self, by the same reason must the Child of a Wife, because under a more ingenuous Dominion, become the Child of him to whom she is so, and he both claim a paternal Authority over him, and the Child owe him the subjection of a Son.

2. Upon the same principles may we establish that Sons receiving the priviledges of a Son, and the being accounted of the same rank and dignity with him to whom he is so. For even *adopted* Sons are in the account of law of the same condition with their Parents, as well as the natural Sons of theirs. And though I no way doubt our Saviour had a more intimate title to the alliance of *David*, because affirm'd in the Old Testament to be the *fruit of his body*, as in the New, as concerning the flesh to have come from the fathers, which he could not do but by the Virgin Mary, because receiving his flesh from her; Yet is it not to be despis'd, that he may in estimate of law be reckoned as from them by Joseph: Partly, because this will add a farther confirmation to his descent, and partly, because men are commonly valued rather by their fathers than mothers condition. For so it may seem not unreasonable to think, that the Evangelists did therefore choose rather to derive his Pedigree by Joseph, than by her from whom he naturally descended. However it be, both the one and the other Evangelist deriving his Pedigree by Joseph, neither can we altogether avoid to found his relation to *David* in him, nor yet found it in *him*, considering what St. Luke hath said, but by supposing such a legal relation between him and Christ: Those words of St. Luke *being, as was suppos'd, the Son of Joseph*, importing rather his being such in point of Law and Custom, than by a vain and false imagination. For beside that that undoubtedly is the more literal notation of the word *husbands*, and so made use of by the same Author elsewhere; it seems somewhat hard to imagine, if we think he had any design in his Genealogy, that he should in the very entrance of it lay a blot upon it himself, by representing him, whose pedigree he then deduced as only *misdeem'd* to be the Son of Joseph, whose line yet he makes use of and no other for the attaining of his design. So easy a matter is it to assail all those difficulties which are objected against this strange conception and birth from the Scriptures; But how much more easy to assail those which the bare reason of man may raise to it self against it. For as those difficulties have no other ground, than that all natural births are otherwise produc'd, which yet is no bar to a supernatural one; so he must have a mean opinion of God (by whom Parents even in conjunction are enabled to produce their like) who cannot also believe he can by his own Almighty power easily supply the want of one of them. For how otherwise had it been possible for him to have given being to mankind at first? Or how otherwise, as the Scripture assures us, and was before sufficiently established, made him without the help of either Parent, yea out of that very earth on which he treads?

3. But because we have not only to do with pretenders to reason, but with those also whom no reason nor any but their own Scriptures will satisfy; and because moreover it is agreed between them and us, that the Scriptures of the Old Testament give apparant marks of that Messiah concerning whom our disquisition is, therefore it will be but necessary to shew,

<sup>c</sup> Psa. 132. 11.

<sup>d</sup> Rom. 9. 5.

<sup>e</sup> Luc. 3. 23.

<sup>f</sup> Act. 18. 13.

<sup>g</sup> Gen. 2. 7.

shew, that he, whom we affirm to be the person, and so miraculously born, was also so foretold there: It being not to be thought that those Prophecies which are so minute in other particulars, would be silent as to so considerable a circumstance. And indeed neither are they so, however it comes to pass that the *Jews* do not or will not apprehend them; though it must be confess'd withal, that they do not all speak in the same tone, but some only in soft murmures, whilst the others are more loud and clear.

\* Gen. 3. 15.

<sup>1</sup> Protevangelium  
um Paradisia-  
cum.

Of the former nature I reckon that first Prophecy <sup>b</sup> concerning the Messiah, and which, as *Helvicus* <sup>c</sup> hath shewn at large, their writings as well as the Text it self incline us to interpret of him. For how came he to be so carefully stil'd *the seed of the woman*, rather than of *the man* or *both*, were it not that God was willing to have it understood, that it should be in a more particular manner hers, and though the man also should reap benefit by him, yet he should not contribute to the production of him? For though the woman were both *first* and *more immediately* foil'd by the Serpent, yet the man was *also* carried in triumph by him, and he therefore in all probability as likely to be mentioned, were it not that it was intended, that he should not alike concur to the production of this promised seed. It is true indeed, this was so softly whisper'd in the fore-mentioned Prophecy, that they, to whom it was address'd, did not so understand it; for we find, as was before observ'd, that the woman understood it of that seed <sup>d</sup>, which was alike the seed of her Husband and her self. But as it is not much to be wondred, that God should not all at once discover that truth which he meant for so many years to defer the exhibition of; so we shall find such light given to it by the significations that followed, as not to suffer us to doubt in like manner of it. For to go

\* Gen. 4. 1.

\* Gen. 22. 18.

\* Gen. 49. 10.

\* Gen. 18. 10.  
12.

\* Psa. 51. 5.

\* Jer. 31. 22.

\* Num. 16. 30.

on to him, in whom it was foretold that *all the nations* <sup>e</sup> of the earth should be blessed, and which we cannot well suppose to have been compleated but by the coming of him to whom it was said that the *gathering* <sup>f</sup> of the nations should be, because the Jewish Nation as such contributed little to the blessing of the nations; How near was his birth to that which we now depredicate, how fair an intimation of it? For though he was not born of a Virgin, yet of one <sup>g</sup> who was equally unapt to conceive, and by one too who was unapt to beget: So that we may say, that the birth was in a manner supernatural, and rather the work of God than man. After which it was not at all unreasonable to expect a like production of him, by whom this blessing was to be immediately bestow'd: Especially, when the work that was to be done by him requir'd so immediate a concurrence of the divine Majesty. As indeed how otherwise should he be born, who, because to bless both the Jews and the Nations, was in reason to be free from that natural corruption, wherewith they were alike tainted, and which *David* <sup>h</sup> himself confess'd to be traduc'd to him by his Parents. But because the Texts hitherto alledg'd are rather intimations than clear proofs, and beside that, cannot be denied to stand in need of other light than their own; therefore pass we on to one which is much more clear and explicit, and which the late diligence of learned men hath rendred worthy of our notice. For how long, saith the Prophet *Jeremy* <sup>i</sup>, wilt thou go about O back-sliding daughter? For the Lord hath created a new thing in the earth, A woman shall compass a man. That something miraculous is here understood, that phrase of creating a new thing in the earth, and a like passage in the Book of *Moses* <sup>j</sup>, where he speaks of the opening of the earth upon *Korah* and his Company will not



not suffer any reasonable man to doubt. But neither can there be any doubt of its appliableness to the conception of a Virgin, both because a *new thing*, and a very proper *compassing of a man by a woman*. The only question is, whether that be really the sense of it, and if it be, what reason there is to apply it to the conception of the Messiah. The Jews, as their manner is, oppose us in both, and some Christians, as Dr. Pocock hath well observ'd<sup>1</sup>, are so unwise as to comply with them. But what reason do they alledge either against that sense, or for the setting up a different one of their own? Is it because the word נקבה signifies a *married woman*, as Rabbi Lipmannus would have it? That indeed were a material objection, and, if true, would perfectly overthrow our interpretation. But it is so far from that<sup>2</sup>, that it signifies barely a *female*, and is accordingly sometime<sup>3</sup> made use of to denote a *maid child newly born*. Is it then that the context determines it, whatsoever it means, to the Children of *Israel's* return from captivity, and not to any deliverance of them by the promised Messiah? But beside that the Jews themselves acknowledge a *first* and *second* sense of many Prophecies, and ought not therefore to refuse it here, it is plain from the following Verses of the same Chapter, that as a *new thing* is here promised to be created, so agreeably thereto it is also promised, that God would make a *new covenant* with the house of *Israel*, which I have before shewn from their own writings to respect the days of the Messiah, and by whom they, as well as we, acknowledge another and a better deliverance to be intended. Both which put together will give an apt reason of the *Prophets* enquiring *why they would go about in their back slidings*, and as apt and forcible a motive to prompt them to *return*: God intending in order thereto to create a new and strange birth to their advantage, and make a gracious as well as new Covenant with them in him. If any thing impair the credit of the *Christian* interpretation, it must be the setting up one to rival it, and which may at least render it doubtful, whether it ought to be admitted. But beside that, as the forenam'd Dr. Pocock hath well observ'd, the Jewish Versions proceed upon the supposition of the word נסח signifying *going about after another*, whereas neither is there any such force in the word it self, neither is the word אחר or *after* subjoined to it; there is nothing at all of *miraculous* or *strange* in the several senses suggested by them. For what is there of miraculoufness (which is one of them) in a *womans seeking to or courting a man*, though it be the more usual thing for the courtship to begin with the other? Especially, when by their own law it was permitted to the wife of him that *died without children* to claim her Husbands Brother for hers, or in destitution of that, the next of kin. What is there of miraculoufness, which is another of their senses, in an *adulterous womans returning to her husband*, whereas for the most part the injur'd party is forc'd to seek after her? for necessity, if not a consciousness of their former errors may send them home. In fine, what is there of miraculoufness, which is a third, for a *woman to be chang'd into or besiege a man*, meaning thereby to denote, that the Israelitish Nation, though now broken and become infirm as a woman, should grapple with men, and men of courage? For as there have not wanted women of *masculine* spirits, so it is not at all unusual for men, before miserably broken, to resume their courage and oppose themselves against their oppressors. Which notwithstanding these and the like senses are the only ones they offer to save that *new creation*

<sup>1</sup> Append. ad Port. Mos. c. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Hulf. Theol. Jud. lib. 1. Part. 2. p. 297.  
<sup>3</sup> Lev. 12. 9.

<sup>4</sup> Jer. 31. 31.



or *miracle* which is here foretold. Having thus as I suppose sufficiently asserted that *prophecy* from the cavils of those who are unwilling to understand it of the *Messiah*, it may be but seasonable to subjoin one <sup>a</sup> which is yet more clear, and by which Christianity hath always thought it self able to maintain the miraculous birth of our Saviour. Behold a *Virgin* shall conceive and bear a Son, and shall call his name *Immanuel*. That a *Virgin* is here intended, we have not only the most ancient Translation of the *Septuagint* <sup>y</sup> to witness, but the *etymology* of the Hebrew word, and the known and usual signification of it elsewhere. For it is agreed of among *Grammarians* that the word *עַלְמָה* or *Virgin* comes from the Verb *עָלַם* which signifies *to hide*, agreeably, as *Grotius* <sup>z</sup> hath observ'd, to the customs of Ancient times, wherein Virgins were not only not permitted to come abroad, but kept in apartments by themselves: Insomuch, that, as the same *Grotius* hath observ'd, *Aquila*, who here would have nothing else but a *young woman* to be understood, doth elsewhere <sup>a</sup>, with regard to the *ἄνθρωπος* of the word, translate the same word by *ἀνέκκευτος*, or the female that is *shut up*. Agreeable hereto is the use of the word elsewhere, that we may not think that any thing of prejudice hath impos'd that sense on it here. For thus *Moses* useth it of *that Virgin* <sup>b</sup> even *Rebecca* whom *Isaac* afterwards married, and of that *sister* of his own <sup>c</sup> which was employ'd by his mother to look after him, when he was expos'd in an Ark of bulrushes, and of whose being other than a *Virgin* we have no presumption. But so also did *Solomon* <sup>d</sup> after him in the same notion, and where there can be the less doubt, because he distinguisheth those *עַלְמָה* or *Virgins* from *Wives* and *Concubines*. Which, with the like use thereof in the *Punick* tongue <sup>e</sup>, which is a *propago* of the *Phenician*, is certainly a competent proof of the signification of a word. If there be any thing of real difficulty in the Text, it must be as to the application of it to the *Messiah* and ours, which the Jews from the beginning have laboured to overthrow. And indeed, he, that shall compare these words of the Prophet with what *precedes* and *follows*, and particularly with the next Verse but one <sup>f</sup> where it is affirm'd that *before the child should know to refuse the evil and choose the good*, there should be no danger to *Ahaz* from those *two Kings* that then molested him, will find himself obliged to acknowledge that it had a first sense in that *Son of the Prophets* afterwards <sup>g</sup> spoken of, and which she conceiv'd and bore by *Isay*. But as whatever she might be at the first uttering of the Prophecy, yet it is certain she was not a *Virgin* when she conceiv'd and bore a Son, so the Prophecy therefore cannot be suppos'd to have receiv'd its full completion in her, and we therefore to look out for one in whom it may. Now to whom can we better refer it than to the *Messiah* and ours, especially when that *Messiah* is not only stiled <sup>b</sup> *Wonderful*, and the *Mighty God*, but the *Son* here spoken of is entitled *Immanuel* or *God with us*. Though if we desire a farther proof of its belonging to the *Messiah*, we may receive one from the Jews, because applying, though falsely, this Prophecy to *Hezekiah*, whom they, though as erroneously, sometime look'd upon as such. To all which if we adde the evidence we have of our own *Messiah's* being thus born, and the no appearance or pretence there is of any other persons being so, so we shall not find any reason to doubt of its being so intended by him, by whom it was first made known to us: His so exactly answering the Prophecy in so *unusual* and *naturally impossible* a circumstance, being a sufficient proof of its having been intended of him.

Which

<sup>a</sup> Isa. 7. 14.

<sup>y</sup> *ἡ ἁγία*  
*ἡ ἁγία*

<sup>z</sup> *Grot. Annot.*  
in *Mat. 1. 23.*

<sup>a</sup> *Gen. 24. 43.*

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>c</sup> *Exo. 2. 8.*

<sup>d</sup> *Cant. 6. 8.*

<sup>e</sup> *Grot. ubi su-*  
*pra.*

<sup>f</sup> *Isa. 7. 16.*

<sup>g</sup> *Isa. 8. 1. &c.*

<sup>b</sup> *Isa. 9. 6.*

Which will consequently leave nothing more to be enquir'd into upon this head, but *what the reason of this so miraculous a conception and birth was*, the third thing propos'd to be enquir'd into.

3. For the understanding whereof we are to know, that as *such a High Priest became us who was holy, harmless, and separate from sinners*, be-<sup>1 Heb. 7. 26.</sup> cause otherwise in no capacity of satisfying for the sins of others; so to procure his being *such* it was also necessary he should be so born; as to be free from the contact of that Sin; which all, who were in *Adam* when he offended, were tainted with. Now how, standing the laws of humane births, could the Messiah be so born; as to be free from so great and killing a pollution? For all those being to be look'd upon as having been in *Adam* when he offended, who were born by virtue of that *Benediction* of male and female, by the concurrence of which humane births were<sup>\* Gen. 1. 28.</sup> then determined, he also, if begotten by virtue of the same, must have been look'd upon as having been *in him*, and tainted in the same manner with other men. Which as it plainly insinuates the necessity of his having been born by virtue of *another benediction*, and such as was *post-nate to the fall of man*, so doth so far forth therefore evince the necessity of this Conception whereof we speak. For that it was accomplished by virtue of *another Benediction*, the Conception it self declares, as both the end of that Conception, and the promises that were made concerning it, that *that Benediction was post-nate to the fall of man*. For neither was there any promise of this seed of the woman till after she was foil'd by the Serpent, neither could there have been any need of it; if she and her Husband had not thus fallen, because intended for the cure of those bruises they receiv'd by it. This I choose to say rather than what is commotly suggested to free our Saviour from the taint of Original corruption. For though the Holy Ghost by his bare overshadowing might free this or any other conception from it; yet could it not, because it cannot make that which is past not to have been, have hindred this holy thing; if it had been conceiv'd in the ordinary manner, from having *been* and *offended in Adam*, and consequently from being obnoxious to it. Which how it doth, or can agree with the dignity of the Son of God; I shall leave all sober men to judge. So apparantly necessary was it, for this Son of God to be conceiv'd and born by virtue of *another benediction* than that by which other the Sons of men are; and that there was the like necessity of the Holy Ghosts cooperating to it, will appear if we consider the natural inability of the Virgin to conceive him; and much more, with those holy and gracious qualifications, which became this High Priest of ours. For as where natural causes fall short, a supernatural assistance must step in to enable them to produce that to which they are so indispos'd; so, where holiness as well as humanity is to be produc'd, the concourse of *that supernatural one* which is the proper fountain of it.

IV. I am now arriv'd at my fourth and last particular, even *the end of this Son of Gods assuming our humane nature*; a thing, which though not express'd in this shorter Creed of ours, unless perhaps the Compilers thereof thought it sufficiently intimated in the name *Jesus*, yet may seem to have been omitted rather for the notoriety thereof, than that it did not think fit to inculcate it: Not only that of our Communion Service representing it to have been *for us men and for our salvation*, but the Scripture distinctly affirming it to be *a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptance that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners*.<sup>1 Tim. 1. 14</sup>

Which, as it shews the Salvation of Sinners to have been the great end of his Incarnation, whose conception and birth is now under consideration, so to make it yet farther evident, I will now shew the tendency thereof to the procuring of that end which appears to have been designed in it. For well may that be represented as its end, which is not only so declar'd by him who propos'd it to himself, but for the compassing whereof there is such a congruity in the means, that it will be hard only to imagine a more apt and convenient one. It is sufficiently known how ill a posture the world was in when our Saviour came into it, nay in how ill a posture that part of it was, which he had separated from the rest. But neither is it less known, how ineffectual all those methods had prov'd, which God had before made use of to reclaim it. For so far were the Jews from listening to their ordinary instructors, that even those were hardly attended to, who were immediately commissioned by himself, and carried upon them apparent marks of his power as well as of his Authority. After which nothing remain'd but the sending of his Son, Heaven it self having not any thing besides by which it could hope to subdue their obstinacy. But here again another inconvenience did present it self, and which, if not prevented, would have made the remedy worse than the disease. For neither could they be suppos'd to bear the presence of so great a Majesty, nor yet, if they could, be over-desirous of conversing with it. That therefore they might with more *freedom* as well as *safety* converse with him, it was but requisite that this Son of God should appear in their own likeness, and so temper those glories of his divine nature, that they might be amiable as well as terrible, or at least be in a condition to be endured. Which as it is so far forth a fair account of our Saviours *incarnation*, and to which if the Scripture concur we can find no reason at all to oppose our selves; so that it is no other than what the Scripture it self hath suggested, a *parable* of our Saviour<sup>a</sup> and a *Prophecy* of Moses<sup>b</sup> doth declare: the former of these representing the neglect and abuse of Gods Prophets as the reason of the sending of his Son, as the latter declaring Gods *raising up a Prophet from among them like unto himself* to have been in compliance with their *desiring of him that they might not again hear the voice of the Lord their God, nor see any more those dreadful attendants of his Majestick presence*. But miserable had our condition been if this Son of God had procur'd only our instruction and amendment, the bringing us to a better understanding of our duty and our selves. For however that might have prevented new evils, yet could it not have cassated the old, and much less, if, as I shall *afterwards* shew, God expected to be atton'd and satisfied for former errors. To procure for us therefore a full and perfect redemption, that also was to be attempted, though with how little hopes of success unless by that Incarnation whereof we speak, is not difficult to divine. For neither, as the *Son of God* and so equal with him, could he *satisfie* for our past offences; nor yet as *man*, (as what nature more convenient for it?) *tender a valuable one*: It being no easy task to satisfy for such an infinity of transgressions, and such as God himself thought worthy of a never ending punishment. To procure therefore this so great and glorious a purpose, it was but requisite he should become both, which accordingly we find both by the *Scripture* and the *Creed* that he became. One only thing seem'd wanting toward the perfecting of our redemption, even the *destruction* of him or rather of his Authority, who through the Commission of God as well as by our offences

<sup>a</sup> Mat. 21. 33.

<sup>b</sup> c.

<sup>c</sup> Num. 18. 15,

26.



offences had the power of death <sup>v</sup> over those who had been disobedient <sup>† Heb. 2. 14.</sup> to Gods commands. But as whatever that power of his was, it was founded in the offences of those who had been committed to him to be punished; so he could have no pretence to it, after that this Son of God had first assum'd; and then satisfied in our nature for those offences; which were the only tenure by which he held it.

## Suffered under Pontius Pilate.

### The Contents.

*Of the sufferings of Christ, and why the mention of them is immediately subjoin'd to that of his Conception and Birth. Evidences out of the Old Testament, and out of the writings of the Jews of the suffering of the Messiah, and a brief account from the New of the sufferings of ours from his Agony in the Garden to his condemnation to the Cross. In passing is shewn what is to be thought of Christs suffering in his Soul the torments of hell.*

**F**ROM our Saviours Conception and Birth, pass we to his Passion; for **Suffered under Pontius Pilate.** so our Creed directs; not but that many Actions of his life were worthy both of our remark and belief, but that as the chief of them were wrap'd up in the word *Christ* and have accordingly been there taken notice of by us; so this suffering was the chief end of his being conceiv'd and born: The *Author to the Hebrews* <sup>a</sup> instructing us, that God <sup>a Heb. 10. 5; &c.</sup> propos'd and he took that *body which was prepared for him* to make an offering of it; and thereby effect that which no legal Sacrifices could. Only because there are who are prejudic'd against him for that very suffering, as conceiving themselves oblig'd to expect a *Messiah* of another condition, I think it but just, before I descend to the consideration of the sufferings of ours, to shew the *Messiah*, whom their Scriptures foretold, to have been represented as a *suffering* one.

When two of our Saviours Disciples, who it seems dream'd of a glorious *Messiah*, were discoursing as they went to *Emaus* of what had befallen their crucified Lord, that Lord of theirs, who was now risen from the dead, join'd himself to them, and expostulated with them concerning that their sadness. To which when they had made answer, that it was because of the death and sufferings of him, who, *they trusted would have redeemed Israel*, our Saviour to remove that sadness, and rectifie their opinions concerning the *Messiah*, did thus chide them for their <sup>b Luc. 24. 25;</sup> wonder and infidelity. <sup>b</sup> *O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the Prophets have spoken. Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and so to enter into his glory?* What Prophecies our Saviour made use of for that purpose the Historian hath not told us; if he had, our procedure would have been so much the more safe and easy. This only he hath told us, which yet will give us sufficient encouragement to enquire into

<sup>a</sup> *Ibid.* v. 27.

it, that he deduc'd this great Article <sup>c</sup> from *Moses* to the last of the *Prophets*. For how should we fear to miss of a competent proof of that, which he evidenc'd from every particular Prophet? And indeed, as who-soever shall look into the Ancients, will find them copious in such Allegations, however not apprehended by us to belong to him to whom they are appli'd; so it would be too great a temerity in us to pronounce therefore of the generality of them as rather fanciful than solid ones. For beside that many of those Prophecies, which are now otherwise understood, might then have been generally acknowledg'd as belonging to the Messiah, and therefore not unreasonably urg'd; How otherwise can we suppose our Saviour to have demonstrated those sufferings of his from *Moses* and all the subsequent *Prophets*? For neither can we think those Prophecies not to have been many, which were deduc'd from so many Prophets, nor yet, not to have been transmitted by those, to whom they were alledg'd, to such whom they instructed in the faith, and so down to the Ancient Fathers of the Church. Either therefore let the present Age find out as many others which are more pertinent, which I doubt it will hardly do; or, which perhaps will better become it, and may be more useful, enquire more curiously into the force of those, which they find to have been heretofore so appli'd. For so possibly they may find more in them, than they at first apprehend, or at least, than the present Jews will be willing to acknowledge. Sure I am, of those, that are alledged by the Apostles themselves, there are not a few, which may seem as far removed from the Messiah, as many of those that are alledged by the other.

<sup>a</sup> *Gen.* 3. 15.

But to return to that which is our proper business, even the evincing from the Scriptures of the Old Testament the sufferings of the Messiah; where first of all, what is there, in *Moses*, from whom our Saviour first evinc'd it, that may be supposed to be more pertinent than that so often quoted Prophecy concerning the seed of the woman? *And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed. It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.* For shall we say, that, as the Prophecy is not so clear for the Messiah, so we want therein the stipulation of those with whom we dispute? But it is apparant that both the *Hierosolymitan Targum*, and that of *Jonathan Ben Uzziel* refer this Prophecy to the Messiah; as the latter moreover affirm, that in his days, there should be a remedy for the biting of the heel. Now by what way of argumentation can they infer this from the present Prophecy, by which we may not also infer the biting of the Messiah's heel, and so his suffering from the Serpent? For all that looks in it like such a consolation to them who had been foiled by the Serpent, is that Prophecy of the seed of the woman bruising the Serpent's head, which will consequently determine that seed of the woman to signify no other than the Messiah, and therefore also, because it is the same seed that is afterwards spoken of, that he should be bitten in his heel. But neither, if it be well adverted to, will there be found less in the text it self to constrain us to that interpretation. For what other can the Serpent there spoken of be than the devil in one, even that Old Serpent, as the Scriptures of the New Testament call him for that very reason, as elsewhere <sup>s</sup> the Father of lies, and a murderer <sup>b</sup> from the beginning? Not only the sense of the Jewish as well as Christian Church inclining us so to believe, but that part which the Serpent acted, and that Artifice which he made use of to deceive our first Parents. For these things cannot in the least be verified of the *natural*

<sup>a</sup> *Vid. Helvic. Protevangel. Paradis.*

<sup>c</sup> *Rev.* 12. 9.

<sup>s</sup> *Joh.* 8. 44.

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*

*ral*

the Serpent, which, whatever cunning it may be suppos'd to have, yet must be remembred to have been reckoned among *the beasts of the field.* <sup>Gen. 3. 1.</sup> Not to say, that that Serpent, which this *more subtle* one made use of, had his *curse* before; and such a one as was more futable <sup>to that nature</sup> <sup>Gen. 3. 14.</sup> whereof he was compos'd. Now if the Serpent here intended were no other than the *Devil*, and whom we know from the Scripture to have been the murderer of mankind, what can be more reasonable than to suppose the seed of the woman that is confronted to him to be no other than the Messiah? this being not an Adversary for every Son of man to encounter with. Of not much less force, as to this particular, is that Ancient Translation of the *Septuagints* varying the gender from the neuter to the Masculine, when it comes to speak of this seed of the woman's bruising the Serpents head. For reading not, *It shall bruise thy head*, but *He*, they plainly shew this seed of the woman to have been then understood, not of mankind in general, or at least of a multitude, but of *one individual person*, by which what other can we understand than the Messiah so often prophesied of? Especially when, as was before observed, the Jews themselves could see so much of it, as to apply it to the *days* of the Messiah. But if the seed of the woman be no other than the Messiah, then have we enough to shew that he was to be a suffering one, because affirmed here to be bruised by the Serpent; there being no other than a corporal bruise, which we can well understand of the Messiah.

From that first Prophecy concerning the Messiah, pass we to that more noted one of *Jacob*, and which we have before <sup>in</sup> demonstrated to relate to him; where after he had said, that *the Scepter should not depart from Judah, nor a Lawgiver from between his knees until Shiloh come*, he adds <sup>Gen. 49. 11.</sup> *which cannot so well be referr'd to any as the foregoing Shiloh, Binding his foal unto the vine, and his asses colts unto the choice wine, he washed his garments in wine and his clothes in the blood of grapes.* Which, as *Justin Martyr* <sup>observes</sup>, was a Prophecy of that *Ass* <sup>Apol. 2. p. 73.</sup> our Saviour rode in triumph on, not long before his Crucifixion, and of that blood of his wherewith his garments should be dyed. For as it is not unusual to represent the blood of men by the blood of the grape; as is evident from the *sixty third of Isay*, he who is there describ'd *red in his apparel by treading in the wine-press*, being by the same Prophet interpreted to be one who should *trample upon his enemies*; and have his garments dyed in their blood; so being this passage of the Messiah's *washing his garments in the blood of grapes* is subjoin'd to the mention of the *ass* and *the colts the foal of an ass*, the riding on which, as it was not long before his Crucifixion, so is it by the Prophet *Zachary* alledged as an instance of his lowliness (*for behold, saith he, thy king cometh unto thee lowly, and riding upon an ass and a colts the foal of an ass*) it is but reasonable to interpret it of what he himself should suffer; and washing his garments in *his own* blood. Only as if any man think these Prophecies to be too *obscure*, to found so great a truth on, he may supply what seems wanting in them from more *clear* and *explicit* ones; for all I aim at in them is to shew, that they contribute in some measure to the proof of what they were intended to evince. For that being granted; it will follow, that though of themselves not sufficient to prove the thing intended, yet they will add not a little strength to it, in conjunction with other and more explicit ones, which in the next place I intend to produce.

Of this nature I reckon, and I think not without reason, that of the Prophet



Prophet *Isay*, Chapter the *fourty second* and the *fourth* verse. *He shall not fail, nor be discouraged, or broken till he hath set judgment in the earth, and the Isles shall wait for his law.* For what greater proofs can we desire of that passage being intended of the Messiah, or that suppos'd, of his suffering and death? In the *first* verse of that Chapter he is declar'd to be Gods elect, and particularly beloved servant; one upon whom he would put his Spirit, and one who should bring forth judgment to the Gentiles; as in this verse again, one who should set judgment in the earth, and for whose law the Isles should wait. In fine, for so it follows in the *sixth* verse, one who was given for a covenant of the people, and for a light unto the Gentiles. For how well doth this agree with the quality of him to whom it was foretold that the gathering of the Gentiles should be, and in whom all the nations of the earth should be blessed?

<sup>a</sup> Maimon.  
Pres. ad Perek  
Chelak seu cap.  
10. Traff. San-  
hedrim. p. 160.

But why go I about to prove that from the Text, which is acknowledged by one of their own writers <sup>a</sup> to have been a Prophecy both of the Messiah and his death? As indeed well he might, after so apparant marks both of the one and the other in this and the verses that accompany it. For wherefore should the Prophet make mention of his *failing* or being *broken*, but that he should sometime be so, and give proof of his misery as well as glory.

But of all the Prophecies that respect the sufferings of the Messiah, there is certainly none more clear and full, than the *fifty third* Chapter of *Isay*, each verse whereof almost speaks his passion. *He is despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief.* So verse the *third*. Surely he hath born our griefs, and carried our sorrows, yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted. So verse the *fourth*. Yea he was wounded (as the same Prophet goes on) for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed. And again verse the *seventh*, he was oppressed and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth. He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth. Now I demand of any man who is willing to be satisfied, what proofs there are of any Texts belonging to the Messiah, which are not to be found here? Do they, with whom this controversie is, deem it reasonable to shew, that the *Ancients* of their own Nation did so understand this? But if this may pass for a proof, we shall find our selves well provided, as who have not only the *generality* of their *Ancient Doctors* interpreting the verses immediately preceding this Chapter of the Messiah, and to which, if we compare the *second* verse of this with the *fourteenth* verse of the former we shall find it apparantly to connect; But some of them also <sup>c</sup> as *Jonathan* in his *Paraphrase* expounding the main of this Chapter of him, as others again, and particularly the Author of the Book call'd *Pesikta* that remarkable passage of it, concerning *his bearing our griefs*. Is it then that things *glorious* enough are not spoken of the person here describ'd? For I hope, when that is the thing in question, the bare dolours of the person spoken of shall not exclude the Messiah from being understood. But he must be a very superficial considerer of the words, who shall not be able to discern in them things that do very well agree to the dignity of the Messiah. For beside that in the verses preceding this Chapter, he is stiled the *servant of the Lord*, which is a title the Messiah is elsewhere known by, one who should be exalted and extolled, and very high, which last expression

<sup>c</sup> Vid. Hulf.  
Theol. Judaic.  
li. 1. part. 2.  
pag. 321. &c.

expression *Rabbi Alsheber* understands of his being unto God as a Son, <sup>1</sup> *Hulf. ibid.* even that Son to whom the father said, *Ask of me and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance*; We shall find it affirm'd of him in this very Chapter, that after he should make his soul an offering for sin, he should see his seed, he should prolong his dayes, and have the pleasure of the Lord prosper in his hands; In fine, not only see of the travel of his soul, and be satisfied, yea make others satisfied with his justification of them, but divide him a portion with the great, and a spoil with the strong, which are characters no way dissonant to the Jews own glorious conceptions of him. Is it lastly, that the contents of this Prophecy can be fairly attributed to any other, and so make it at least questionable whether it were to be understood of the Messiah? But to whom, saving to the Messiah, can we attribute those emphatical ones, *But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and by his stripes we are healed*? As again, *All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquities of us all*? For what appearance is there in the Scriptures of the Old Testament of Gods laying upon one man the iniquities of others, unless it be those of his Ancestors, whereas here we find upon one man the iniquities at least of a whole Nation? What appearance is there of his so laying them on one, as altogether to acquit the offenders from their guilt, yea to procure to them peace and health. For even of *Ahab*, to whom it was laid upon his humiliation that God would not bring the evil threatened in his <sup>1</sup> *1 Kings 21.* dayes but in his Sons, yet must it be observed that a part thereof fell upon himself, as having his blood licked by Dogs, according to the tenour <sup>29.</sup> of that threat, in the very same place where *Naboth's* had been. <sup>1</sup> *1 Kings 22.* <sup>38.</sup>

Lastly, for that of all others ought not to be forgotten, because the Messiah is there expressly named. It is the affirmation of the Prophet *Daniel*, that *Messiah the Prince* should be cut off, which doth more than <sup>2</sup> *Dan. 9. 26.* shew him to be a suffering one. And indeed so far have the Jews themselves been overcome by these and other like Texts which speak of the passion of the Messiah, that they have for that reason invented a double Messiah, even a suffering and a glorious one: to the one whereof they give the name of the *Son of Joseph* or *Ephraim*, to the other of the *Son of David*. But beside that there is not in the Scriptures any footsteps of such a double Messiah, no nor yet in their *Ancient Doctors*; In about forty places which the Paraphrasts *Onkelos* and *Jonathan* <sup>2</sup> interpret of <sup>2</sup> *Hulf. ibid.* the Messiah there being no mention save of one only: There is this farther to be said against that vain imagination of theirs, that there is hardly any one text which presents us with a suffering Messiah, which doth not also describe him to us as glorious as they can fancy the other to be. Will they allow that of the seed of the woman to be understood of a suffering Messiah, as one should think the being bruised in his heel should oblige them to grant? But of him it is affirmed, that he should break or bruise the head of the Serpent, which if the Devil be to be understood thereby, is as great an Elogy of him as can be desired. Will they allow that of *Jacob* to be one, which foretels of his washing his garments in the blood of grapes? If they will, they must also allow him to be as glorious as any Messiah *Ben David*, because affirming the scepter to belong to him after its departure from *Judah*, and that unto him should the gathering of the

<sup>1</sup> *Hulf. Theol. Judaic. li. 1. parte 1. pag. 37.*

the nations be. Will they allow that of their own *Maimonides* to be so, and from which (as was before observed) that great *Rabbi* infers the death of the Messiah? But he, who is there suppos'd to fail and be broken, is also represented as one whom God upholds, that elect one in whom his soul delighteth, one upon whom he puts his spirit, and who should bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. In fine, will they allow the fifty third Chapter of *Isay* to be a Prophecy concerning the suffering Messiah? They will not only (as was before noted) find very glorious things attributed to him, but attributed to him too, both after and because of his making his soul an offering for sin. For therefore (saith God there) will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong. Which shewshim not to have been without power to accomplish what he had begun, and that therefore there was no need at all of setting up another Messiah to crown that so glorious a work. And though I will not lay any great stress upon what I am now going to say, because I know not how far the Jews will allow of Gods making past things or persons to serve as types of future ones; Yet if that be true, as Christianity obligeth us to believe, and is not difficult to infer from the concessions of the Jews themselves (for not only do they allow a mystical as well as a literal sense of Scripture, but make one and the same Scripture to have reference both to some person that was nearer to the Writer, and to the Messiah, which will make that other person to be someway a type of him: But if, I say, that be true) I see not how they can avoid making David to be a type of the Messiah, or allowing of it, but grant also that he was to be a suffering one. For well may he be allow'd to be a type of the Messiah, who had not only two of that Messiah's anointings upon him, even those of King and Prophet, but is known also to have given the Messiah his own name. For thus, to omit other places where the Messiah is expressly stiled David, he is so called by the Prophet *Hosea*\*, even by the Confession of their own *Chaldee Paraphrast*. Not as I should think merely because he was *David's* son, (for why then should not other of his Sons have been called by the name of David, even as the several descendants of *Pharaoh* and *Ptolemee* were by theirs?) but that he was as another David, that David was a type of him, and he an antitype of David. Which if true, it will be hard to exclude a suffering condition from him, because David was not more eminent for his piety or regality than for that. Sure I am, as it will be hard to find any better ground of the Jews stiling their suffering Messiah the Son of Joseph, than that Joseph was a person exemplary for his sufferings; So they might for that reason as well have made Messiah the Son of David to be the Sufferer, because his Father and type David were no less: As not only might his, as well as Joseph's sufferings, as such, become typical of the Messiah's, but in regard also of their glorious end; both the one and the other emerging out of their calamities, and governing afterwards in their respective places with great power and glory.

It appearing from the premises, what great reason our Saviour had to say, Ought not Christ to have suffered and so enter'd into his glory, it will be but reasonable, as the Creed directs, to reflect upon the suffering of him, whom we own and avow to be the Messiah. For my more advantageous consideration whereof, I will proceed in this method,

\* Hof. 3. 5.



1. I will shew that this our Saviour *suffered*, conformably to the Prophecies that went before concerning him.

2. I will enquire in what part of him he suffered.

3. Shew what these his sufferings were, or at least, so far as the *Creed* gives us occasion to enquire.

1. Of the first of these little needed to have been said, had not some heretofore arisen who questioned the reality thereof. For well may he be look'd upon as a *suffering* person, who is by the Jews ignominiously stil'd the *Hanged one*, and affirm'd by the Heathen to have been put to death in the reign of Tiberius by Pontius Pilate Procurator of Judea. Though neither will those *Hereticks* before-mention'd give us any great trouble, having already shewn him to have been *really* and *truly* man. For being so, he must be suppos'd to have suffered really from those accidents where-with he encountred, unless God had vouchsafed him the same assistance he did to the *three children* in the Furnace, and with whom this Son of God, though in a more glorious nature, may then seem to have been. But how far God was from doing that, his own sad behaviour under his sufferings, and particularly his complaint of Gods *forsaking* him in them, the injury and in fine death which he receiv'd from them, and Gods consideration of him for them afterwards may satisfy any reasonable man. For each of these apart will shew them to be real, and how much more, when all together?

2. But neither shall I need to stand long to shew, *in what part* of him this our Saviour suffered, which is the next thing propos'd to be enquir'd into. For as if the Scripture had not told us, that he was *put to death in the flesh* <sup>b</sup> or *humane nature*, we our selves might well enough have <sup>b</sup> 1 Pet. 3. 18 thought so, because that is the only *possible* one, so we can as little doubt, after the assertion of the Scripture, that he suffered in his *soul* as well as in his *body*. For neither otherwise would our Saviour have affirm'd that his *soul was sorrowful unto death*, and much less, if there had not been some trouble upon his mind, cried out, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?*

3. The only thing remaining to be enquir'd into, is *what those* our Saviours *sufferings* were; A question which will best be satisfied, by a brief account of them out of the Scriptures, and to which therefore I shall address my self for it. And had other men contented themselves with such an information, or, after the prudent temper of the Ancient Church, with the believing the griefs of his soul to be *unconceivable* and *inexpressible* ones, to which after all our enquiries we must at length be forc'd to come, we had never heard of his suffering in his soul *the torments of hell*, which yet we have been forced to hear. For neither (as I shall by and by shew) is any such thing contain'd in his affirming, that his soul was *exceeding sorrowful even unto death*, nor yet, if we consider that *Psalms* <sup>c</sup> from whence it was taken, of his crying out to God, *Why hast thou forsaken me?* <sup>c</sup> Psal. 22. 1: That being grounded by the Psalmist upon God's not vouchsafing him his wonted assistance against those many evils he had to conflict with, and which are afterwards enumerated by him. That which in truth gave occasion to the former assertion was not the simple doctrine of the Scripture, but an inference of the Asserters from Christs becoming *our Surety*, who had deserv'd such torments, and the *disproportion* of *temporal* punishments to *eternal* ones. But first of all if we may be allowed to speak with the *Scripture*, as certainly in a question of this nature

we may, it can be no inconvenience to affirm, because that Scripture hath  
<sup>a</sup> Col. 1. 20. so done before us, that our Saviour <sup>d</sup> *made peace by the blood of his cross*,  
<sup>e</sup> Aët. 20. 28. and that he *redeem'd and purchased us by* <sup>e</sup> *his blood*. Whence it is that  
<sup>f</sup> alibi. in the doctrine of the *Sacrament* it is called *the blood* <sup>f</sup> *of the New Testa-*  
<sup>g</sup> Mat. 26. 28. *ment*, as elsewhere *the* <sup>g</sup> *blood of the covenant* wherewith we are sancti-  
<sup>h</sup> Heb. 10. 29. fied. Neither is it any prejudice to this Assertion, that our Saviour was  
the *Surety* of those who deserv'd eternal punishments, and for which  
therefore he was to make amends: For this he might well do by other  
sufferings, as being not only man but God; The excellency of his *per-*  
*son* adding to the value of his sufferings, and making them not only equal  
to, but to exceed those we had deserv'd. And indeed as he was no way  
capable of that which is one of the chief torments of Hell, even the  
*gnawings of a troubled conscience*; the *taking upon him our sins* being  
an act highly pleasing unto God, and which consequently could give him  
no such trouble: So if it had been necessary for him, who was our surety,  
to have suffered the same torments we were to undergo, he must have  
suffered eternally, because that was confessedly our portion. In the mean  
time if any be unsatisfied with our way of reasoning, let him see how he  
will answer the Author to the Hebrews, who lays the price of our Savi-  
ours sufferings, not upon the sufferings themselves, but upon the dignity  
and innocency of him that underwent them. For if (saith he <sup>h</sup>) *the blood*  
<sup>i</sup> Heb. 9. 13, 14. *of bulls and goats sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much*  
*more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal spirit offered up*  
*himself without spot to God, purge your consciences from dead works*  
*to serve the living God.*

To give an account now, as was before propos'd, of the sufferings of  
our Saviour, and so much the rather because it may serve both to inflame  
our love to him, and confirm us yet farther, by the agreeableness thereof  
to those that were before foretold, in his being the Messiah. But where  
shall I begin the History of our Saviours sufferings? I have already said  
that the *Creed* confines us to those he suffered *under Pontius Pilate*, and  
therefore it is but requisite I should so bound my discourse. But even of  
those he suffered under *Pontius Pilate*, that is to say, in his time, there  
were no inconsiderable ones which he suffered before he was brought be-  
fore him. And indeed, though the Scripture do more particularly attri-  
bute our redemption to his *cross*, as being not only the chiefest part but  
the complement of his sufferings; yet it is manifest from the *fifty third of*  
*Isay*, that there was no *bruise or chastisement* of his, which did not con-  
tribute thereto: and therefore it is but necessary that we should begin  
our History of his sufferings where we find the first traces of them, which  
were in his *Agony* in the Garden. In a Garden <sup>i</sup> we all know it was that  
<sup>j</sup> Gen. 2. 8. we began to offend, and there <sup>k</sup> therefore it was that he began to satisfy  
<sup>l</sup> Joh. 18. 1. for it; as if God would mind him by the place of the great transgression  
that was there committed, and for which, together with all those sins that  
flow'd from it, he was now to atone an incensed justice. Sure I am, what  
ever influence that place of pleasure might have upon his thoughts, it sug-  
gested to him no very pleasant ones. For if we enquire of those, who  
have transmitted to us an account of his behaviour there, we shall find  
him full of grief, and such a one too, as did not only *discompose* but even  
<sup>m</sup> Mat. 26. 37. *astonish* him. He began to be *sorrowful*, saith St. *Matthew* <sup>n</sup>, he began  
<sup>o</sup> Marc. 14. 33. to be *sore amaz'd*, saith St. *Mark* <sup>o</sup>, to be *very heavy*, say both <sup>p</sup>. But  
<sup>q</sup> Ibid. why stay we here? He best knows his grief who feels it. Let us there-  
fore

fore listen not to the Historians, but to him whose trouble they describe. What sad complaint is that I hear? *My soul is exceeding sorrowful<sup>o</sup> even<sup>o</sup> unto death.* *Πηλαγός ἐστιν ἡ θύχη μου ὡς θανάτος*, my soul is even encompassed with grief, a little Island begirt with a Sea of tears. Though neither will that expression, how emphatical soever, give us a just account of it, unless we consider it also with reference to that place <sup>P</sup> from whence, as a <sup>P</sup> Learned man <sup>q</sup> hath observ'd, it was manifestly borrowed, and where <sup>q</sup> it is made use of by the *Septuagint* to express that passionate interrogation of the Psalmist, *Why art thou cast down O my Soul.* For so we shall find the importance thereof to be, that that sad Soul of his was not only surrounded but over-whelmed with grief, and did even bow and sink under the weight of it. But once more, saith our Saviour, *My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death*, neither could I well feel more, though I were under the direful pangs of it. I see before me all those sad stages through which I am to pass, what affronts, and pains, and reproaches I am to encounter with; and these my apprehensions and their consequent fears wound me even before I am pierced, and I am crucified in my own thoughts and apprehensions, before I come to be nailed to the accursed tree. But so, as an ingenious *Author* <sup>r</sup> hath well expressed it, that death <sup>r</sup> which comes slowly, and creeps over many waves before it arrives at us, <sup>r</sup> kills us before we suffer it, and the poor Mariner who lives long enough to look about him, and sees himself in the midst of a wide Sea, hath his fears extended as much as that Ocean, and not only every wave that passeth over him, but every wave he beholds drowns him, because he fears each will. Such, you see, even by our Saviours complaint, was the present Agony of his Soul, so strong were his apprehensions of his future sufferings, and he so distressed in himself because of it. But that it was not to such a degree as to take from him all hope of Gods supporting him under, and in fine delivering him from what he fear'd, that very sad complaint of his is a sufficient evidence. For borrowing those very words from his sad type and forerunner *David*, he could not but withal reflect upon that comfortable address of his to his so cast down Soul, *Hope thou in God, for I shall yet praise him, who is the health of my countenance and my God*: We have heard our Saviours sad complaint to some of his Disciples, but who, it seems by their sleeping presently after, were not much affected with it; Let us now listen to that prayer which immediately after he made to God, and where to be sure it met with a less drowsy, and a more favourable attention. *O my father<sup>r</sup> if it be possible let this cup<sup>r</sup> pass from me*; and again, *O my father, if this cup may not pass from me except I drink it, thy will be done*; and yet a third time, *O my father, if this cup may not pass from me, thy will be done.* For can the holy Jesus give entertainment to such thoughts? Can he much more give vent to them at his lips? He, I say, whom the work of our redemption drew down from Heaven, he who came on purpose to drink that bitter cup for us? Certainly great must have been the trouble of that Soul, in which such desires could find place, especially so intense and vehement: That, as if it had not been enough with *strong cries and tears<sup>r</sup> to have<sup>r</sup> prayed to be delivered from death*, he must also importune him with a shower of *bloody sweat<sup>u</sup>* which issued from every part of his body. Thus <sup>u</sup> even in the garden may we find a *Golgotha*, a place not of delight but of extream misery and sorrow; in fine a place, as the present Agony witnessed, where he met with nails, and thorns, and spears, the dire instru-



ments of his future passion. Not that I deem these to have been the objects of his grief *meerly* as such, but as moreover they were expressies of Gods wrath against those for whom he undertook, and which therefore were to be set upon him with as much severity as Gods kindness to him for so great a condescension would permit him to inflict. For there have been *perhaps* of this our Lords Servants and Martyrs who have met with external pains not inferiour to his, but which they did the more chearfully undergo, because the sting of them was before remov'd by this their Saviour's antepast thereof.

Our Saviour had no sooner ended these his proemial sufferings, but forth he went <sup>a</sup> to meet those his Enemies who were come to seize him <sup>v.</sup> *Judas*, one of his own Disciples, had now sold him for *thirty pieces of silver* <sup>2</sup>, to purchase whom a pious soul would have parted with all the world: And the bargain being now struck between them, he brings them with him, to give them possession of him. No sooner had he esp'd our Saviour, but he <sup>3</sup> from before the rabble that came with him, and goes towards him, whom, when he was now come to, he saluted with *Hail Master* and a *kiss*. The Clubmen and Spearmen who came with him, when they saw whom *Judas* kiss'd (for that was the *token* he had given them to know our Saviour by) went on to apprehend him. But the great power of *Jesus* <sup>4</sup> and their own fear and guilt struck them at first to the ground. At length *Jesus* rather *yielding himself* that so he might suffer for us, than having been apprehended by them, delivers himself into their hands, upon which all his Disciples forsook him and fled. Imagine now what grief possess'd our Saviour at this instant, even when he saw himself betray'd by one of his Disciples, and forsaken by all the rest. He was before under the power of his Enemies, and shortly after to feel the sad effects of it; he was now as destitute of Friends as he was infested by Enemies, yea found an Enemy among the other. For *Friend*, saith he to *Judas*, *betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss?* I would to God thou hadst never been my friend, or being my friend hadst never betray'd me. For *had it been an Enemy*, as *David* speaks <sup>b</sup>, *that thus reproached me, then I could have born it, or he, that hated me, that magnified himself against me, then I could have hid my self from him.* But my misery and grief too is, it was *thou a man mine equal, my guide and my acquaintance. We took sweet counsel together, and walked into the house of God in company*; and the consideration of that and thy present baseness pains me at the heart. But what! dost thou betray me too with a kiss and a friendly salute, the usual tokens of affection and respect? This is yet more bitter to me than the other. Those words of thine *Hail Master*, and that *kiss*, though to outward appearance *smoother than butter*, yet are they *very swords*, and wound me deeper than the reproaches or blows of my Enemies. Our Saviour would have given more vent to his grief, but the boysterous Serjeants, who came to take him, would not suffer it; haling him as fast as they could to *Jerusalem*. At length they arrive at *Annas's House* <sup>c</sup> a man of great Authority among the Jews as having been formerly High Priest <sup>d</sup>, and even now in the reputation <sup>e</sup> of one; whither being come, and *Annas* examining him concerning his doctrine, our

<sup>a</sup> Joh. 18. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Mat. 26. 47.

<sup>3</sup> Mat. 26. 15.

<sup>4</sup> Joh. 18. 6.

<sup>b</sup> Psa. 55. 12.

<sup>c</sup> Joh. 18. 13.  
&c.

<sup>d</sup> This *Annas* (as *Josephus* tells us) had been made High Priest, not by right of descent,

but by the favour of *Quirinus* who was sent by *Augustus* to be President of *Syria*. *Valerius Gratus* Procurator of *Judea* in *Tiberius* his time put him from being High Priest, and substituted first *Ismael* the Son of *Fabus*; a little after that *Eleazar* the Son of *Annas*, then after a year *Simon* the Son of *Camithus*, and lastly *Joseph* who was surnamed *Caiaphas*. *Jud. Anc. lib. 18. c. 3.*

<sup>e</sup> This appears from the Jews carrying our Saviour first to him, and from *St. Luke's* reckoning him as Copartner in that Office with *Caiaphas*. *Luc. 3. 2.*

Saviour refer'd him for answer to those that heard him, adding withal that he had *taught nothing in secret*. Upon this one of the Officers, that stood by, struck him with a rod<sup>c</sup>, with all reproving him for answering *Annas* in that manner. But to this the meek and patient *Jesus* made no other return, than that if *he had spoken any evil* they should do well to *bear witness of it*, but if not, they had *no reason to strike him*. O Blessed Saviour, how vast is the difference between our behaviour and thine? Thou didst not so much as revile that person who had thus abus'd thee, we, on the contrary, pursue even unto death, those, who do, it may be, only return our own calumnies. But this affront that was put upon our Saviour in *Annas's* House was a very small one if we compare it with those he receiv'd in *Caiaphas's*, whither *Annas* immediately<sup>e</sup> sent him. Now unto him were assembled the Chief Priests, Elders, and Scribes, to consider of *Jesus*, how first to make him<sup>b</sup> guilty, and then put him to death. Great was their diligence in seeking after false witnesses, many devices they had to patch up an enditement against him; and to make their proofs agree together, but all would not do. Neither could they find our Saviour guilty, nor, which is more strange, make him seem to be so. *Caiaphas* therefore, as who had now no other means left him to find out an accusation; but from what he should be able to extort from himself, adjur'd him by God, by some Curse laid upon him if he did not speak and answer truly; to tell him whether he were the Christ the Son of God. Our Saviour, who was not ignorant how much it concern'd him to answer to such an adjuration; as to which he was oblig'd by the divine law<sup>i</sup>, and being moreover mindful of the necessity that lay upon him not to be wanting, at such time as this, to that great truth he came to publish, answer'd directly and fully to the High Priests question that he was<sup>k</sup> the Christ the Son of God. At the hearing whereof what tragical outcries were rais'd among them, how strange was their behaviour? The High Priest himself, though forbidden by God to rend his garments (as may not improbably be collected from *Lev. 21. 10.*) yet as if our Saviours Blasphemy, for so they call'd it, could warrant in him the breach of a Commandment, rends his Clothes, and desires to know of his Brethren; what their opinion was of him, who had been so bold as to say he was the Christ. An opinion which we may well imagine they would not be very backward to give, neither were they; for they soon made answer that he was *worthy of death*. And here began a new scene of cruelty and contumely, but which is always to be expected from those who are the inferior Officers of justice, and whose business it is rather to gratifie their Masters, than to intend the execution of the laws. For then, without any command from their Masters for ought that doth appear, did this forward sort of men spit in his face, blindfold and then buffet and cudgel him; adding taunts to their blows and reproach to his pain; for prophesie (say they) *O Christ who it is that smote thee*. And, as if all this had not been enough, *Peter*, who had before so cowardly forsaken him, was now return'd; in this sad conjuncture of affairs, more shamefully to deny him, and perjure himself. A circumstance which certainly added greatly to his other afflictions; if yet it did not by the enormousness thereof, make him forget the anguish of the other. For however such a contumelious usage could not but grate upon him, who, in this as well as in other particulars, was not without the common resentments of humane nature, yet his pious Soul could not but be much more afflicted by this so great a dishonour

<sup>c</sup> Joh. 18. 22.  
for so ἵδων  
ἐπεισάκουτο  
οὐκ ἔδεικνυτο  
ἵνα ῥηθῇ  
ἵνα ῥηθῇ.  
Ἐκείνῳ.  
<sup>d</sup> Mat. 26.  
67. Καὶ ἐκ-  
λάσσαν αὐ-  
τὸν ὡς ἐπὶ  
ῥάβδον.

<sup>e</sup> Joh. 18. 24.  
Ἀπεσταλμένος,  
&c. Therefore,  
or upon these  
words Annas  
sent him, &c.  
<sup>f</sup> Mat. 26. 59.

<sup>i</sup> Lev. 9. 1. &  
Grot. in Annot.  
ad Mat. 26. 63.

<sup>k</sup> Mat. 26. 64.  
ὅτι ἦν, ἡ δὲ  
ἐστὶν ὡς ἐπὶ  
ῥάβδον, seu  
ut dixisti;  
quemadmodum  
LXX. utuntur  
verbo ἵπναται,  
Exo. 10. 29.  
Sed vid. etiam  
Marc. 14. 62.  
ubi pro ὅτι  
ἦν legitur  
ἵδων.

dishonour as was done to his heavenly Father by a shameful perjury; as that too, in one of his own Disciples. But to pass from the High Priests Hall to *Pilate's* Judgment Seat<sup>1</sup>, whither as our Saviour was immediately carried, so he met with new matter to exercise his patience. For now he was accus'd, not of Blasphemy, which it may be would not have signifi'd much there, but, of what he sufficiently hated, downright sedition, and forbidding to give tribute unto *Cesar*. A charge which as it was not difficult for him to wipe off, when a bare denial of it may suffice; so, to take away all occasion of suspicion, he told his Judge that the *Kingdom* he laid claim to was *not of this<sup>m</sup> world*, that it was an Empire over mens hearts rather than over their bodies or estates. And *Pilate* was so well satisfi'd with that answer of his, that he told the Jews *he could find no fault in him*. But the Jews howsoever persisted in their accusations, and, that they might not be wanting to make them as plausible as they could, nam'd *Galilee* for the place<sup>n</sup> wherein he had first stir'd up the people to rebel against their lawful Prince. An accusation, how idle soever, which cost him a new trouble, because it occasion'd *Pilate* to send him to *Herod*, whose that Province was, and of which our Saviour was a subject. To *Herod* therefore they bring him, *who had now a long time desir'd to see him* by reason of the fame of his miracles, and because he hoped in this conjuncture to have seen some strange one done by him. But our Saviour who never did miracles to please great mens humours, but to confirm his own doctrine, and bear witness to Gods glory, was not then pleas'd to do any. Whereupon *Herod*, with *his men of war*, set him at naught and mocked him, and, after he had in derision array'd him with a gorgeous robe, sent him again to *Pilate*. Back the Jews come, mad at heart that neither *Herod* nor *Pilate* would condemn him, and they themselves had not power to put any man to death, as being wholly under the power of the Roman Emperours, and their Deputies *Herod* and *Pilate*. And now their malice, like a mighty stream meeting with opposition, riseth higher and swells above those banks that before kept it in. They formerly accus'd our Saviour of being a rebel to the Emperour, but now they fear not to accuse *Pilate* himself<sup>o</sup>, and tell him to his face, that if he let our Saviour go he was not *Cesars* friend, nor faithful to that Emperour, whose Deputy and Vicegerent he was. But *Pilate*<sup>p</sup>, who well knew our Saviours innocency, labour'd what he could to rescue him from the Jews malice. In order whereunto he told them, that it was customary at that festivity for the Governour to release unto them a Prisoner, and that, if they pleas'd, he, who was now before them, should owe his life to their mercy. But the Chief Priests and Elders, to whom such a proposition was no way acceptable, perswaded the people to ask the life of *Barabbas* rather, and one who had made himself sufficiently notorious by his Sedition and Murthers. But if I release *Barabbas*, replied *Pilate*, *what shall I then do with Jesus*, so loth was he to be thought to understand, what he saw well enough they were obstinately bent upon. But he, that is even wilfully ignorant, shall not long be so under the instruction of such teachers; for they now speak out so plainly that it was impossible for *Pilate* not to understand them, the general Cry being, *Crucify him, Crucify him*, which accordingly *Pilate* condemn'd him to. Such were the sufferings of our Saviour before his *Crucifixion*, the *passion* to that bloody Pasover. But here, because the *Creed* hath distinguished his *Crucifixion* from them, I must put a period to my discourse, and leave my Readers to the consideration



ration of them. And indeed as these alone do bespeak him a man of sorrow, and such a sorrow wherein he had no equal, so may, without the Addition of the other, serve for a proof of the greatness of those sins of ours that caus'd them, and of that love and kindness which prompted him to undergo them.

## Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was Crucified.

### The Contents.

*The History of our Saviours sufferings resum'd and prosecuted to his expiration upon the Cross. After which a comparison is made between them and the accounts of the Ancient Prophets. A conclusion of the whole with some reflexions upon his suffering, and being Crucified Under Pontius Pilate.*

**W**E left our Saviour in our last under a condemnation to the Cross, whither the next words in the *Creed* oblige us to follow him; and well we may who are now to follow him, not by the like sufferings, but by the more easy traces of our eyes and thoughts. When *Pilate* had, but in vain, attempted to rescue our Saviour from the Jews, and protested his own innocency by the washing of his hands, *he delivered him*<sup>a</sup>, *after he had scourged him, to be crucified*<sup>d</sup>. For thus it<sup>a</sup> Mat. 27. 26. was customary among the Romans, from whose hands he suffered, to exercise those that were to be Crucified with slighter punishments, as a kind of *Prologue* to the ensuing *Tragedy*. This done, he was lead away by the Souldiers to the *Prætorian Hall*, there to suffer whatsoever their witty malice would be pleas'd to inflict upon him. He had call'd himself a *King*, and they will take care that he shall not want the Ornaments of one, but they shall be such as shall not add much to his dignity and honour. They put a Crown upon his head, so far you will say was well; but this Crown was only a Crown of Thorns. They array'd him likewise in a purple Robe, another ensign of Sovereignty, but which ceas'd to be so, where it was attended with a thorny Crown, and a reeden Scepter. Lastly, they *saluted* him as if he had been a King, and *bowed the knee before him*; but it was only to compleat the Pageantry, and dishonour this despised Prince by all those wayes, by which the world was wont to express their respects to others. Having thus pleas'd themselves with this sad pastime, they took off his purple Robe, and put on his own Clothes, but we read not that they medled with his Crown. They were willing he should enjoy that pungent honour, neither did they envy him that Crown, which was studded, not with Diamonds, but with Thorns. Imagine now our Saviour on his way to Mount *Calvary*, groaning under the burthen of that Cross they had laid upon his shoulders, and, if you please to consult St. *John*<sup>b</sup>, Joh. 19. 17. you

¶ Lam. 1. 12.

¶ Luc. 23. 39.

¶ Mat. 27. 46.

you will find he bare his Cross before it bore him, and fainted under it before he suffered upon it. The malicious Jews seeing our Saviour faint under that Cross they had laid upon him, not out of pity to him, but fear lest he should die by the way, and so escape the torments of a lingering death upon the Cross, laid it upon the shoulders of one *Simon a Cyrenian*, whom they press'd for that service. At length they came to the place where our Saviour was to be Crucified; there they took the Cross from off *Simon* the Cyrenian and fastned our Saviour to it, then fix'd his Cross in the ground, which with its fall into the place that was dug for it, gave infinite torture by so violent a concussion of our Lords body, which rested upon little else than four great wounds. And now if ever *behold and see* if there were any sorrow like unto his sorrow, *where with the Lord afflicted him in the day of his fierce anger*. Behold and see his hands and feet pierc'd with nails, even those parts of his body which were of all others the fullest of Nerves and Sinews, and consequently most sensible of pain. Behold and see the Company he is Crucifi'd with, even such who were as far remov'd from him in the causes of their death, as they were in the quality of their persons; persons whose extream guilt had made them deservedly obnoxious to those tortures, which nothing but the malice of his Enemies had brought upon our Saviour. Lastly, Behold or rather consider those scoffs and affronts which he receiv'd, whilst he hung in all this misery. *Ab thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days*, so some of them reproach'd him, *save thy self and come down from the cross*. And he saved others, said the Chief Priests, and Scribes, and Elders, *himself he cannot save: If he be the King of Israel, let him now come down from the Cross, and we will believe him*. He trusted in God, *let him deliver him now if he will have him, for he said, I am the Son of God*. And, that no sort of persons might be wanting to their power to insult over this miserable man, one of the *malefactors*, that was hanged with him, and who, one would imagine, should have been better instructed by his own sufferings, railed on him after the same ungodly manner, and reproach'd him with that *weak* greatness which he pretended to. But it may be amidst these torments and that reproach, his grief was somewhat abated by the compassion of those friends that came thither to lament him. And so possibly it might have been, if any thing could have made him forget the great affection he had for his Mother, and *whose soul* whilst he knew to be *pierced thorough* by every nail that grated him, the smart thereof could not choose but return upon himself, and he feel her griefs as well as his own. So complicated and intense were those sufferings of the Holy Jesus, which he suffered either in himself or others: And yet even these were but scratches if compar'd with those stabs which he receiv'd in his Soul from the consideration of the present face of Heaven. The greatness of which anguish because it is impossible for me either to conceive or express, I will leave men to guess at by that complaint of his, wherein I am sure there was nothing of despair, because it was the complaint of our Blessed Saviour, but certainly there was much of grief in it,

*My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?*

Having thus given, though a brief, yet a particular account of the sufferings our Saviour, as well those which were antecedent to, as those he suffered upon the Cross; It will be but reasonable to look back into the Prophecies of the Old Testament, and see how those sufferings of his do accord with them. For by how much the more particular the correspondence

denice between the one and the other is, so much the more reason is there to believe, that our Saviour was that *Messiah* of whom the Prophets did foretell: It being not to be thought that God would have suffered so many circumstances to concur in him, who was only a pretender to that title. Only because I do not remember I have said any thing of one of the Prophecies to be alledged by me, I will first shew it to have belong'd to that Messiah whom God instructed the Jews to expect. With what consent among Christians the *two and twentieth* Psalm is understood of the Messiah, needs not at all to be said, for neither doth or can, after the Scriptures of the New Testament so applying it, any, that calls himself by that name, doubt of it. But how shall we evidence so much to a Jew, who will therefore be the more backward so to interpret it, if it were only to disappoint the Christians of its assistance. But God be thanked we want not evidence enough to convince even them, if any thing of reason will convince them. For thus first, as we learn from *Grotius*<sup>e</sup>, doth their own Writer of the *Midras Tehillim* understand it, which shews that we are not the only persons that have so interpreted it. But so also, if we may judge any thing by the Ancient Christians so applying and urging it, did the Jews of their times understand it, or at least their common Forefathers did: It being not otherwise to be thought, that they would not have alledg'd some proof of it, if that sense thereof had been likely to be question'd. I alledge thirdly, the *Jews* making use of those very words to reproach our Saviour with<sup>g</sup>, wherewith the person there described is. For<sup>h</sup> either those Jews who so reproach'd our Saviour, understood that *Psalm* of the *Messiah*, but, because they thought him to be a counterfeit one, thought they might truly enough apply that reproach unto him; or they let fall those expressions by the secret dispensation of the divine Providence: it being hardly to be suppos'd, considering they are represented by the Psalmist as the words of wicked men against a good, that they would otherwise have made use of them, lest instead of reproaching our Saviour they should have reproach'd themselves. If we say the former of these, we have those very Enemies of our Saviour bearing witness to the truth of our allegation, which is as strong a proof against the Jews as can be desir'd; Especially if it be considered, that those reproachful words are the words of no other than their *Chief Priests*, and *Scribes* and *Elders*. And indeed when I consider what those Chief Priests, and Scribes and Elders subjoin'd as the ground of that their saying, I am yet more confirm'd in that my suspicion. For making the ground of it to be our Saviour's affirming himself to be *the Son<sup>h</sup> of God* or *the Messiah*, they<sup>i</sup> seem to me to intimate that it was true enough that such a reproach should be directed against the *Messiah*, but which the *true* Messiah should confute by the delivering of himself, and which if he also did, but they did not at all fear considering how little appearance there was of it, they also would become his Profelytes. For who could think, or at least who of them could, that the Messiah should be altogether forsaken? Especially when he whom our Saviour pretended to be, is brought in afterwards<sup>j</sup>, affirming, that *God had not despised nor abhorred the affliction* of this afflicted one, *neither had he hid his face from him, but when he cried unto him he heard him*. This I take to be the true and genuine sense of those reproachful words of the *Chief Priests*, and *Scribes* and *Elders*, and so perhaps will others when they come more nearly to consider them. Though if not, they may perhaps serve for as forcible a proof another way

<sup>e</sup> Grot. Annot.  
in Mat. 27. 43.

<sup>g</sup> Mat. 27. 43.  
compared with  
Psa. 22. 8.

<sup>h</sup> Mat. 27. 43.  
For he said, I  
am the Son of  
God.

<sup>i</sup> Psa. 22. 24.



of the same Psalms belonging to the Messiah. For when those words of theirs were manifestly the words of wicked men, and which therefore could bring no credit at all to those that us'd them, who can think the *learned part* of the Jewish Nation would have made use of them? were it not, that God suffered them so to do, thereby to give a testimony, though against their will, to our Saviours being a beloved Child of God, yea to his being that Son of God which was to be the Messiah, because he declar'd himself to be so. But then if it be moreover considered how rarely well the several passages of this Psalm symbolize with our Saviour's condition, and in such instances too of which there was no knowledge at all at the time and place wherein the Psalmist lived (for with the *piercing of a mans hands and feet* the Jews were not acquainted till the Romans brought the Cross among them) so no doubt at all will remain of their being intended of this our Crucified Saviour, and consequently also, (because a good man will not give out himself to be other than he is) of the Messiah.

The way being thus plain'd to the Argument now before us by the establishment of that Psalm which is more than once to be made use of by us; enquire we after that accord which we have affirmed to be between the sufferings of our Saviour and of the Jews Messiah. In order whereunto I will lead you as far back as his *Agony in the garden*, because that will present us with two notable circumstances which the Scriptures of the Old Testament foretold. It hath been observed by the Evangelists, as was before noted, that the consideration of his approaching sufferings, and the intenseness of his Prayer thereupon, put him into such an Agony, that *his sweat was as it were great drops of blood*. Now abating for the difference of the expression, which yet is not less emphatical in the Prophecy, and what other doth the Psalmist say, when, speaking in the person of the Messiah, he tells us <sup>k</sup>, that he was *poured out like water*, and that *his heart was like wax, it was melted in the midst of his bowels*. For when our Saviours fears and apprehensions were such that they put him into so strange a sweat, how natural was it for the Psalmist, speaking in a Poetical strein, to say that he was *poured out like water*, and that *his heart was melted in the midst of his bowels*? Such a sweat, as is before described, looking like a dissolution of his inward parts, and which, upon that dissolution, stream'd out at the pores of his body. Again, it was affirm'd by our Blessed Saviour of himself, that *his soul was exceeding sorrowful even unto death*, that he was surrounded and over-whelmed with grief. But what other doth the Prophet *Isay* affirm of him, when he affirms in his *fifty third* Chapter, that he was *a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief*, that he *bath born our griefs and carried our sorrows*, that *it pleased the Lord to bruise him and to put him to grief*? These being expressions of a more than ordinary sorrow, yea of a *sorrow unto death*, as our Saviour himself entitled it. From our Saviours *Agony*, pass we to his future treatment in *both the High Priests, Herod, and Pilate's Palaces*; where again we will consider the great contempt he suffered from them, and his far greater patience and silence under it. For was not this Saviour of ours contumeliously stricken in *Annas* his House, buffeted, spit upon, and mock'd in *Caiaphas's*? Was he not set at naught by *Herod* and his *men of war*, and in token of the like derision sent to *Pilate's* array'd in a gorgeous Robe? Lastly, was he not as contumeliously us'd in *Pilate's* Quarters, when they put a Crown of Thorns upon his head; and a

Reed

<sup>k</sup> Psa. 22. 14.

Reed instead of a Scepter in his hands, and, together with the *bowing of the knee*, cried, *Hail King of the Jews*? But so that he ought to be by the presignifications of the Prophets, is clear both from *David* and *Isay*: From the former, where he brings in this Messiah saying of himself<sup>1</sup>, *I am a worm and no man, a reproach of men and despised of the people*; from the latter, where he tells us<sup>m</sup>, that he is *despised and rejected of men*, and again<sup>n</sup>, that *he was despised and we esteemed him not*. Such was the reproach both of the one and the other Messiah, of him whom the Prophets foretold, and of him whom the Gospel exhibited. And as their reproach was alike, so their behaviour was equally meek and patient; they did not spit in the faces of their revilers, no nor yet shew any great uneasiness under that or their other sufferings. If our Saviour, *when he was reviled, reviled not again*<sup>o</sup>, *when he suffered threatened not, but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously*; the Prophet *Isay* will tell us of his Messiah, that *though he was oppressed and afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth, he was brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so opened he not his mouth*. In fine, if there were an agreement between these two Messiah's in their proëmal sufferings, there was no less between their sad Catastrophe's, they were both scourged, crucified, and contumeliously used even then. For thus, to say nothing of our Saviour, because we have already given an account of his sad usage, it is by the Prophet *Isay* affirm'd of his Messiah<sup>q</sup>, that *the chastisement of our peace was upon him*<sup>r</sup> and that *by his stripes we are healed*; by the Psalmist of his, that they *pierced his hands and feet* yea<sup>t</sup> that his sacred body was not only strip'd of its garments, as the bodies of crucified men were, but (which shew'd yet more that that was the punishment he alluded to) that it was so plac'd and so extended that men might clearly and distinctly behold it, as by that view be enabled to *tell all his bones*: Those in the mean time, who had thus denudated and expos'd him, intending only the *parting of those garments* they had stripp'd him of, and *casting lots upon his vesture*. Which is so clear and distinct a description of a Crucifixion, yea of this particular one, that I know not whether the Psalmist could have express'd it in more proper terms, if he had been an eye-witness thereof. But neither lastly, is the agreement less as to the concomitants of this Crucifixion, than there is as to the Crucifixion it self. For if the *Evangelists*, to let us know with what additional ignominy this Crucifixion was attended, give us to understand that he was crucifi'd *between two thieves*, yea that he was rail'd upon and revil'd by those thieves and others, the Prophet *Isay* will tell us of his<sup>t</sup> that he was *numbred with Transgressors*, as the Psalmist acquaints us with both the gesture and words of those by whom he was afterwards to be reproach'd. For what difference is there between his affirming<sup>u</sup> that *all they that saw him laughed him to scorn*,<sup>v</sup> *they shook out their lips and shook their heads saying, He trusted on the Lord, that he would deliver him, let him deliver him seeing he delighted in him*; What difference is there, I say, between this and the Evangelists affirming<sup>x</sup>, that *they that passed by reviled our Saviour wagging their heads and saying, Thou that destroyest the temple and buildest it in three days, save thy self*: As others again almost in *ipsis* verbis, *He trusted in God, let him deliver him now if he will have him*, for he said, *I am the Son of God*. So true is that which St. Paul spake<sup>y</sup>, that *they who dwelt at Jerusalem and their rulers fulfill'd the*

Isa. 22. 6.

Isa. 53. 3.

ibid.

1 Pet. 2. 23.

Isa. 53. 7.

Isa. 53. 5.

Psal. 22. 16.

— 17. 18.

Isa. 53. 12.

Psal. 22. 7. 8.

Mat. 27. 39.

&amp;c.

Act. 13. 27.

*Prophecies* concerning the Messiah by their *condemning* ours: For so exactly did their evil treatment of him answer that which was foretold, that we may seem to need no other proof of his being the intended Messiah, than their contumelious usage of him.

Of our Saviours suffering and crucifixion I have spoken hitherto, together with the agreeableness thereof to the Ancient Prophecies; proceed we now, as the *Creed* directs, to consider of his *suffering under Pontius Pilate*, or rather of his both *suffering and being Crucified under him*. For though the present *Creed* subjoin that circumstance only to his suffering, yet, as his *Crucifixion* was not less, yea rather more under him, so it is manifest from the *Ancient Creeds*<sup>2</sup>, because taking notice only of his Crucifixion, that *that* ought to be considered as alike concerned in it.

<sup>2</sup> Ruffin. *Exposit. in Symb. Apost.* Crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato.

<sup>3</sup> *Castissime autem qui symbolum tradiderunt, etiam tempus quo hæc sub Pontio Pilato gesta sunt, designaverunt, ne ex aliqua parte velut vaga & incerta gestorum relatio vacillaret.* Ruff. *Exposit. in Symb. Apost.*

<sup>b</sup> See for this 1 Tim. 6. 13. Act. 25. 9. and Mark 13. 9. where the Preposition *in* is so us'd and accordingly rendered by our Translators.

<sup>c</sup> Psal. 2. 2.

Now there are two things which we may suppose to have been intended by the *Creed*, when it represents our Saviour as having suffered or been crucifi'd *under Pontius Pilate*. 1. Its being done in his time and government. 2. Its being procur'd by his command or sentence. If we take those words of the *Creed* in the former of these senses, as indeed it is the most natural one, so we may suppose them to have been added the more to confirm men in the belief of that which they are called upon to profess. For otherwise, as *Ruffinus*<sup>a</sup> observes, it might have been look'd upon as an *uncertain* relation, and which therefore might as reasonably have been rejected as receiv'd. But as by the addition of that *circumstance* men were delivered from those jealousies which the uncertainty of the time of any thing is apt to create in the minds of men; so they were thereby put upon enquiring into the stories of those times, and thereby also farther confirmed in the truth of it: It being the affirmation of *Tacitus*, from whomsoever he receiv'd his information, that this Christ, whereof we speak, did not only suffer in his time, but by the *procurement* and *sentence* of *Pontius Pilate*. And though I am not so well satisfied, by the reason that is commonly alledged, of the same having been the intendment of our Saviours suffering *under Pontius Pilate*, or as the Greek *Creeds* express it, *in Pontio Pilato*, because though the preposition *in* have a peculiar reference to *Courts of Judicature*, yet it is only as it connotes the Criminal's *appearing at*<sup>b</sup> or *before* them, and not, as in the *Creed*, the suffering by their sentence; yet will it not be difficult to collect that intendment from the former notion of the *Phrase*, and the nature of the thing affirmed to have hapned; They who affirm a man to have receiv'd a publick punishment under such or such a persons government, especially if that person were the immediate governor and judge of the place, supposing him to have receiv'd it by his sentence, because it belongs only to such persons to inflict them. But so if we understand the words of the *Creed*, as it is but reasonable to do, especially when it is sufficiently known that *Pontius Pilate* was our Saviours Judge, they will afford us two farther Arguments of *his* being the Messiah, who is thus affirmed to have suffered under him. First because he, by whom he suffered, was a Heathen; And Secondly, because he did not only declare our Saviour to have been innocent, but was moreover not without a strong suspicion of his being the Messiah. Of the force of the former of these the Ancient Prophecies will not suffer us to doubt, because assuring us that the Messiah was to suffer; as is evident in part from their foretelling<sup>c</sup> that the *Kings of the earth should take counsel against the Lord and against his Christ*, but more



more especially from the punishment they foretold; This, because a foreigner to the Jewish Nation, supposing its infliction by those, who were alike strangers to it. Of no less force, as to this particular, was our Saviours suffering by the Sentence of him, who was not without a strong suspicion of his being the Messiah. For well may we deem him to be such, who was so thought of even by this his Crucifier; yea to such a degree, that he was not only afraid <sup>d</sup> for that reason to put him to death, but proclaim'd <sup>d</sup> Joh. 19. 8. him to be the <sup>e</sup> King of the Jews even in that title which he set up over his head, neither could be induced to alter it <sup>f</sup> how instant soever the Jews were to persuade him to it. Which makes it yet more probable, what we learn from *Tertullian* <sup>g</sup>, that this Crucifier of our Lord gave such <sup>h</sup> Apol. c. 21. an account of him to Tiberius, that he propos'd in the Senate, with the <sup>i</sup> cap. 3. prerogative of his own voice, the enrolling him in the number of their Gods. In the mean time great must the sin of that man have been, who, notwithstanding such an opinion concerning him, could yet so far comply with others as to deliver him to be Crucified. And God, who punish'd the Jews afterwards for inciting him to this horrid act, did not suffer even this Gentile to go unpunished. For being afterwards accus'd before *Vitel- lius* President of Syria for a slaughter by him committed upon the chief of the Samaritans, that President <sup>b</sup> substituted another in his place, and sent him to Rome to answer the crimes that were laid against him. After which falling into great calamities, this no less sinful than miserable man laid violent hands <sup>c</sup> upon himself: The Almighty so providing, that he, who gave way to the taking away the life of an innocent person, should not now have the power not to take away his own. Thus even that *Pilate*, who hath no other place in our Creed directly, than as the Crucifier of our Lord, doth yet not a little concur to confirm us in the belief of all those glorious things which are by the Creed affirmed of him: His own Declarations, and future punishment attesting no less to our Saviours worth, than they do to his own guilt and cowardice.

<sup>a</sup> Joseph. Jud. Antiq. lib. 18. cap. 5.  
<sup>b</sup> 'Ουκ ἀγνο-  
 ον δὲ ἔχον,  
 ὡς καὶ αὐτὸν ἐ-  
 κείνου ἢ ἐπὶ τῇ  
 σωτηρίᾳ Πι-  
 λᾶτος, καὶ ἴσ-  
 ῶν ὅτι τοῦ  
 χεῖνός διέξι-  
 μεν, τοσαύ-  
 ταις πειρασ-  
 σὶν κατέχευ-  
 ῶν λόγῳ συμ-  
 φερεῖς, ὡς ἐξ ἀνάγκης φοιτητὴν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τιμωρὸν αὐτόχροα γινώσκει, τῆς θείας, ὡς ἔειπα, δίκης ἐκ οὐ μακροῦ  
 αὐτὸν μεταλθούσης. Ἰεροῦσιν Ἑλλήνων δὲ τὰς Ὀλυμπιάδας ἀμα τοῖς καὶ καὶ τοῖς τετραγυμνίοις ἀναγερθεῖσιν.  
 Euf. Eccl. Hist. li. 2. c. 7.

Dead.

## Dead.

## The Contents.

*Of the death of Christ, and what evidences there are of it out of the Scriptures of the Old Testament. What assurance we have of our saviour's so dying, and enquiry thereupon made into the ends of it. Which are shewn to be, First, To give the more sure establishment to the truth of his Doctrine. Secondly, To be a pattern to us both as to our dying for the Truth and dying unto Sin. Thirdly, So to satisfy the Divine Justice for our Sins, as both to dispose and oblige God (considering the agreement that was made between them) to admit all mankind to pardon, upon the performance of certain conditions by them. Fourthly, To procure for us upon the same terms a grant of Eternal life; As Fifthly, the collating of that grace by which we may be enabled to perform the forementioned conditions. Sixthly and Lastly, to dispose him by his own sufferings to compassionate ours, and give us the greater assurance of his doing so.*

## Dead.

<sup>a</sup> Crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato & Sepultus. Ruff. Expos. in Symb. Ap.

**T**Hough Crucifixion be a thing from which *Death* will in fine ensue, which made the Ancient Creeds <sup>a</sup> rather suppose than express our Saviour's; yet because our Saviour continu'd not the usual time upon the Cross, and, besides that, the Scriptures do every where lay great stress upon his Death, therefore it was not without reason that latter Creeds have taken notice of it, neither will it be without such for us to consider it. Only that I may not at all be interrupted in my discourse concerning it, I will first of all, though very briefly, make it evident against the Jews that the Messiah whom they expected was thus to die.

For is it that they will not allow any thing of inglorious to befall *him*, of whom they have, and not without reason, so great an esteem? But the contrary is so evident from their own Prophecies concerning the Messiah, that some of them (as was before <sup>b</sup> noted) have found out a peculiar Messiah to lay all those *dolours* upon that the Prophets have foretold. Is it then that it seems inconvenient to bring *him* so low as the state of death, concerning whom so great and glorious things are foretold? But as if they will allow him to fall into great troubles, they ought not lightly to think it any disparagement to him to die, especially if that death be followed by another and a more glorious life; so they must wink more than ordinarily hard, not to be able to discern in their own Prophecies, that this was to be the fate of the Messiah. For thus it is affirmed by the Prophet *Daniel* <sup>c</sup> that Messiah the Prince should be cut off, as by *Isay* <sup>d</sup> before him that he should be cut off out of the land of the living, and so cut off too, that the survivors should be forced to provide him a *Grave*; in fine, that he should make his Soul an offering for Sin, yea pour out that Soul of his unto death: Expressions so plain for the death of him who is there described, that they have been forced to seek out others to

adjust

<sup>b</sup> Explicat. of those words, Suffered under Pontius Pilate.

<sup>c</sup> Dan. 9. 26.

<sup>d</sup> Isa. 53. 8, 9, 10, 12.

adjust those Prophecies to, but with how little reason hath been before declar'd. And though in that Psalm, <sup>f</sup> which speaks most particularly of the Messiah's sufferings, there be not, which may seem strange, any express mention of his *death*; Though the contrary may seem intimated by the express mention there is of <sup>g</sup> Gods hearing him when he cried unto him, and accordingly so understood <sup>h</sup> by those learned Jews who were present at and derided our Messiah's Crucifixion; Yet as it appears from the account that is there given of the Messiah's sad condition, that it was so near to death, that he himself affirms that God had *brought him into the Dust* of it; so that last Prayer of his <sup>k</sup>, that God would deliver his soul from the sword and his darling or only one from the power of the Dog, which darling or only one is by the Chaldean Paraphrase it self interpreted of the spirit of his body, seems to me, and did Anciently to *Justin Martyr*, to be the words of a dying man commending his Soul in to the hands of God, as we find our Saviour <sup>n</sup> afterwards to have done. For who can well understand that *only one* whereof the Psalmist speaks, of any other than the rational Soul? Or when he himself had but just before <sup>a</sup> affirmed, that he was *brought into the dust of death*, think he would concern himself about any other than the securing of that from that savage beast who goes about seeking whom he may devour, and will no doubt be alike forward to do it at our departure hence? Especially when the person there described, passeth from the mention of *many dogs and bulls*, to the mention of *one particular one*. Not that I think with the forementioned *father* that the Souls of Just men shall actually fall under the power of the Devil, but that as he will be forward enough to attempt them, so they ought to pray Gods preservation of them from him, as by which it is, under God, that they shall be so secur'd. For why otherwise should we not think it as strange that Christ should commend *his spirit into the hands of God*, or St. Stephen <sup>o</sup> beg of Christ that he would be pleased to receive his? For the Souls of good men are as little likely not to be receiv'd by God and Christ, as they are to fall into the hands of the Enemy. However it be, as there is no mention in the Psalm we are now upon of Gods delivering him from death, but only of Gods *not despising his affliction* and *hearing his cry*; which he might as well do by taking him to himself, as by otherwise delivering him from the evils wherewith he was surrounded: so it is not therefore to be thought to prejudice that death of the *Messiah*, which he is here affirmed to be near to, and elsewhere more expressly affirmed to have fallen under,

It appearing from the premises that the Messiah was to die, whatsoever the present Jews have been willing to persuade themselves, proceed we to consider of the death of him whom we own as such. Where first of all I will establish the truth of that his death, and then enquire into the ends of it.

That our Saviour did really and truly die is a thing which will hardly require a proof, so constantly hath it been all along affirmed by the Adorers of him, and so constantly both granted and objected by the Enemies of them both. For neither can we judge the constancy of the former to have proceeded from any other cause than a full conviction of the truth of it, as for whose greater glory it would have been that he had never fallen under the reproach of it; nor the concessions and objections of the other save from the notoriety of the fact, as who would willingly enough have found a flaw in so fundamental an Article of our belief. Indeed those

<sup>g</sup> Explic. of those words, Suffered under, &c.

<sup>f</sup> Ps. 22. 14.

<sup>h</sup> Explic. of those words, Suffered under Pontius Pilate, Was Crucified.

<sup>k</sup> Ps. 22. 29.

<sup>k</sup> — 20.

<sup>i</sup> Dial. cum

Tryph. p. 332.

<sup>m</sup> Luc. 23. 46.

<sup>n</sup> Ps. 22. 15.

<sup>o</sup> Act. 7. 59.



† Mat. 27. 50.

Mar. 15. 37.

Luc. 23. 46.

† Joh. 19. 30.

— 33.

— 34.

† Mat. 28. 13.

\* Orig. contra

celſ. li. 2. pag.

95. μήποτε δὲ

μετὰ ἄλλους

αὐτοῖς τῷ

σαυρωθῆναι

†

Ἰησοῦν, καὶ τὸν

δύναται συμ-

βάλλεσθαι, καὶ αὐτὸν ἐπισημαίνει τῷ σαυρῷ ἀποτιθῆναι, ἵνα μὴ τοῖς ἕτεροις λέγουν, ὅτι ἐκὼν ὑπαξίεναι ὁ ὢν

ὁ ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἡδούεν ἀποτιθῆναι, ἐκ ἀποτίθηναι δὲ ὅτι ἐβλήθη πάλιν ὑπεραυτοῖς ἐταπεινώσασθαι ὅτι ἐν

ταῖς αἰσῶσι.

those several persons, who have presented us with the History of our Saviour, are all positive in the affirmation of it, but he more especially who was an eye-witness of it, even St. *John*. For not only doth he affirm, as all the rest had done <sup>p</sup>, that after he had continued some time upon the Cross he gave up the ghost <sup>q</sup>, but assure us moreover upon the testimony of his own eyes, that the Souldiers that watch'd there were so assured of his death that they brake not his legs: as they had done theirs who were Crucified with him. Only one of them, whether to be more fully satisfied concerning it, or to express however some kind of insolence to him, pierced his side with a spear <sup>r</sup>, and forthwith came there out blood and water. A piercing which would have made an end of him, if he had not been before dead, because not only undoubtedly made with a good will, but reaching to his heart, every the least touch whereof is mortal; That water whereof St. *John* speaks, being in all probability no other than that which is contain'd in that membrane which involves it. Sure I am, as both that Souldier and the other expressed no dissatisfaction concerning it; So *Pilate* was so well assured of it, that he gave leave to *Joseph* of *Arimathea* to take him down, as the Jews so far also, that, though they afterwards complain'd of his Disciples stealing away his dead body out of the grave, yet they never yet objected to *Joseph* that he took him down before he was perfectly expired. So great reason had the Evangelists to represent our Saviour as truly dead, and particularly he of them, who was a spectator of that fatal tragedy; Though even that assurance will be render'd yet more firm by the publickness of his death, whether for the manner of it, the place of it, or the time. For being inflicted upon him by a Cross which did at the same time both invite and give men opportunity to behold it; being inflicted upon him near so populous a place as *Jerusalem*. which no doubt sent out enough to be spectators of the punishment of so remarkable a person; being lastly inflicted upon him at the time of the Pasover, and when upon the matter the whole nation had resorted thither: It is not to be suppos'd that our Saviours Disciples would have been so impudent, as constantly to affirm him dead, who was not, when they had so many to convince them of their imposture; or that among those many some would not have been found who would have transmitted to posterity the falshood of so bold an affirmation. For neither among the Jews whom it most concerned to impugn Christianity, hath any as yet appear'd who question'd this Article of our belief. A thing the more to be wondred at, because by this means best of all they might have overthrown that resurrection which was afterwards attributed to him. But as God in all probability <sup>s</sup> permitted so publick a death, that so there might afterwards arise no scruple concerning his rising from it; so the Jews great silence, as to the falsity of the first of these, renders his death so much the more unquestionable, and that resurrection which followed upon it.

The truth of our Saviours death being thus establish'd, enquire we into the ends of it, which we shall find to be,

I. To give the more firm establishment to the truth of that Doctrine which he came to publish. For having not only averr'd before the *High Priest* and *Pilate* his being the *Messiah*, but chosen rather to die the most accused

accursed death, than any way recede from that his declaration, he thereby left no place to the world to doubt of the truth of that, which he had all along so confidently affirm'd: Men being not ordinarily so fond of any fallity as to seal it with their blood; and much less such persons, who have any sense of religion, and of that eternal state into which all departed Souls enter. For however such persons may be sometime suppos'd to be drawn away from truth and goodness, yet hardly when they have before their eyes their departure to that place where any thing of falshood or impiety shall be sure to meet with its due reward. And upon this account it is that St. *John*<sup>a</sup> among other the witnesses of and to our Saviour's doctrine reckons the blood which he shed for us, as which men do not commonly give way to the shedding of; but where they are well assur'd of the truth of what they do so attest.

2. But because this is an *end* which is not at all in controverſie, yea propugned by the Socinians to make men less considerate of the other; therefore proceed we to shew secondly that the death of Christ for its *end* the conforming us to its own image; Whether it be by a more strict and literal resemblance, or by a no less true though Metaphorical one. For thus for the former of these we are told by St. *Peter* that *Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example that we should follow his steps*: That we should follow his steps in our readiness to lay down our lives for the truth, and choose rather to suffer any thing than betray that, or not minister to the glory of God<sup>2</sup>; That we should follow his steps in that patience which he expressed in it, and neither revile those by whom we are so injur'd, nor accuse God for permitting it; In fine to follow his steps in the great charity of that his death, and be as ready to lay down our lives for the brethren<sup>b</sup>, as he was both for them and us. And though that may seem to be a more remote resemblance, but however such a one as we are not over-willing to conform to; yet we understand from that very Apostle who hath given us an insight into the other, that he himself<sup>c</sup> bare our sins in his own body on the tree both to invite and engage us to die in like manner to them; As from St. *Paul* that we are not only to reckon<sup>d</sup> our selves as so dead, but moreover that in token of that we are as it were buried with him in Baptism<sup>e</sup>, neither can we expect to be like unto him in his resurrection; unless we be so planted<sup>f</sup> in the likeness of his death. Though it those words, for if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection, may not be thought a sufficient intimation of what I affirm, that of the same St. *Paul* elsewhere<sup>g</sup> will because more clear. It is a faithful saying, for if we be dead with him, we shall also live with him. If we suffer we shall also reign with him; if we deny so to suffer and so deny him also, he in like manner will deny us. For though there be appearance enough from the foregoing verses that by dying with Christ is there meant the dying in his cause, and not that dying unto Sin whereof we now speak; yet being alike call'd to the one and other imitation of his death, it is but reasonable to understand it as alike common to them both, and we either to stand or fall, according as we do either die or not die with him in them both.

3. As yet we have met with nothing that is controverted in the Christian world, though I would to God this last end of our Saviour's death were more considered than it is; consider we in the next place of his

<sup>b</sup> Grot. de satisf-  
factione Christi  
cap. 6.

dying, so to *satisfie the divine justice for our sins as both to dispose and oblige God* (considering the agreement that was made between them) *to admit all mankind to pardon upon the performance of certain conditions by them.* For the understanding whereof we are *first* to know, that *satisfaction* both in the proper and Christian intendment of it is the *paying of one thing<sup>b</sup> for another*, but which may be thought to be *equivalent* to that which was due; I do not say only in the judgment of him who accepts of it, but in the nature of the thing, and in the judgment of indifferent persons. For, neither, when that, which was under obligation, is discharg'd, is a satisfaction said to be made but payment, neither can that be look'd upon as a *satisfaction* unless by an improper form of speech which is made up more by the benevolent mind of him to whom it is tender'd, than by its own intrinseck value. I observe *secondly*, as which is but a consequent of the former, that *satisfaction* being the paying of that which was not under obligation, it is in the power of the person to whom it is tendered either to accept of or refuse it at pleasure. Because however the acceptance of a satisfaction may be incumbent upon men as a duty, yet as even that is rather through the force of some particular divine command, than from any intrinseck reason, so God neither doth nor can receive any advantage by a satisfaction which the sons of men both may and do from each other. Whether or no, and by what means, it comes to be in the power of the person to whom it is tender'd to accept it under certain conditions as well as either to accept or refuse it at pleasure, is a thing which will require some farther consideration, and which accordingly shall not fail to have it in due time and place.

The way being thus plain'd to the argument we have now before us by this general account of the nature of satisfaction, it may be but just to consider more nearly of the nature of that of Christ, and both explain and establish it. In order whereunto I will first of all remove two *extream opinions*, into which men have unwarily cast themselves, and by which it may be, or at least by *one* of which it is that this great truth hath come to be call'd in question. An opinion hath prevailed, and so far that a man may run the hazard of being reputed an *Heretick* for impugning it, that Christ, by what he did and suffered, paid that very debt which we all owe to the Divine justice. And hence no doubt more than from any countenance it hath receiv'd from scripture, their sending either Christ to Hell to suffer, or bringing Hell into him. Hence also their making the Elects justification to be as ancient as the decree of their election, or at least not concerning themselves much about the attaining of those graces through the mediation whereof the Christian Church hath always believ'd it must be obtained. But as they who propugn this opinion would do well to consider, that the debt that is thus owing is the punishment of the offender, and which therefore cannot strictly and properly be discharg'd but by the undergoing of it himself; As they would do well to consider farther, how inconsistent they are with themselves in it, whilst they attribute to Christ such torments as are in their language eternal in intenseness rather than in duration (for this is to make Christ pay not the same *even in specie* which was due, but that which is only equivalent to it;) So they should do well to consider also, how ill this agrees with the nature of *satisfaction*, which is a term that the Church hath with general consent made use of in this affair, but how much more ill with the doctrine of the scripture, and the many obligations it layes upon



upon us to secure to our selves the advantage of it. For if the debt be paid we are *ipso facto* free, neither can we in justice be debarred of our pardon though we should neither believe nor repent; both which yet the divine will (and no doubt justly) exacts of us toward the attaining of it. But because what danger soever there may be to the Church by this *first extreme*, yet it is not impossible there may be as much danger from *another*, therefore reflect we in the next place upon the opinion of those who though they pretend to believe a satisfaction made, yet such as is more made up by the benevolent acceptance of the aggrieved party, as if a pepper Corn submissly tender'd should be accepted by him for one, than by the intrinsick worth of the thing, and the equivalency thereof to that which ought to have been paid. But as this will hardly pass for a true and proper satisfaction, however a man be sometime satisfied with the *fulfilling of his desire* by how slight means soever that may come to be perform'd; As it will much more hardly pass for a satisfaction to justice, yea the Divine one, if we may judge at all of its desires by what it requir'd of our Saviour: So it is a great affront both to the Scriptures and the satisfaction of our Saviour to represent it only as such wherein the Almighty was pleased to acquiesce, and not as also such which bore proportion to that for which he pretended to satisfy: Because those Scriptures which give us an account of his blood and sufferings, represent that blood of his as *pretious*, as *much more pretious than Gold and silver*, and in fine as the *blood of God*. For these and other such like expressions proclaim the satisfaction to be such, as was valuable in it self, or as *our Church* hath expressed it, and the Sons thereof ought to do after her example, *a full, perfect, and sufficient one*.

<sup>1</sup> Pet. i. 18, 19.  
A. R. 20. 28.

For the evidencing whereof in the sense before remembred, and particularly as it is affirmed by us to have been a satisfaction to the divine justice, I will proceed in this method,

1. I will shew what the demands of the divine justice are.
2. How those demands may be answered by a satisfaction.
3. What appearance there is from the Scriptures of our Saviours so answering the demands of it.
4. What are the consequences thereof both as to God and to our selves.

1. What evidence there is both from reason and Scripture of the Justice of God needs not at all to be said, because we cannot believe him to be a God without. But neither will men need to be told, what Justice we are to understand here, when we speak of making a satisfaction to it for the sins that have been committed against him. For the satisfaction whereof we speak being made by the punishment of him who undertook it, we are of necessity to understand by Justice, that which is conversant about evil actions, and which consequently must be thought to consist in the Avenging of them. The only difficulty in this affair is what the demands of that justice are, and how those demands may be answered without the punishment of him who hath offended. For the resolution of the former whereof we are first of all to distinguish of the Justice of a *supream Prince*, and of a *subordinate one* or a *Judge*. For however justice may demand of the latter the punishment of the Offender himself, because those laws, under which he is, and by which he is appointed to proceed, oblige him so to do; yet can it not demand the like of him who is supreme, because under no such laws as the other is, and because it apper-

tains to him as *Supreme upon weighty reasons* to remit or moderate the punishment. But as it doth not appear how God can be said to be just as to this kind of retribution, if he either remit or moderate punishments without a weighty cause; so it seems at least agreeable to the same justice, when the number of the persons to be pardoned is great, that there should appear some proportionable mark of his displeasure against that infinity of sins which he doth so forgive: Lest otherwise he should be look'd upon as not having sin in that abhorrency, which the immense purity of his nature as well as his own express declarations oblige us to believe. Neither will it avail to say, because goodness and mercy are equally essential to the divine nature, that by parity of reason there ought to appear some considerable marks of it in those miserable as well as numerous objects of it, the fallen Angels. For as when I affirm'd it to be consistent enough with the justice of a Supreme Prince, either to remit or moderate punishments, yet I added withal, where there is a weighty cause; So upon a weighty cause no doubt it may be as consistent with the divine goodness to exclude some kind of beings after their offences from all hopes of mercy and pardon: Especially when there is at the same time upon others, yea upon others of their own rank and nature, expresses of that mercy which is deni'd to them. And who knows, whether that weighty cause *as to the Angels* might not be the great enormity of their offence, or the great ingratitude it involv'd in being committed against him who had plac'd them so near unto himself? But I have yet another answer to return to that Objection, and such as will at the same time both shew the imparity there is between Gods justice, and goodness, or mercy, and the gratuitousness of that mercy which God exhibited unto us, at the same time he denied it to the Angels. For though I grant, as no doubt I ought, that Goodness is as essential to God as Justice is, though I grant the same of Mercy as that hath for its object a Creature purely miserable; yet I do not grant, neither need I, that mercy to be such which hath for its object him who becomes miserable through his own default. For as if by our offence we have deserv'd an eternal punishment, there can be no necessity upon God how gracious soever to impart to us of his mercy; so that mercy wheresoever it is extended must be look'd upon as gratuitous, because there was no necessity upon God to confer it. Hitherto therefore nothing doth or can appear but that justice may and will demand the inflicting of punishment, unless it be where there is a weighty cause for the contrary, as even there, if the multitude of offenders be great, to such a degree as may declare the displeasure of God against their offences.

2. But from hence will easily appear how the demands of the divine justice may be answered by a satisfaction, as well as by the undergoing of that punishment which was due unto the offence. For if it be no way inconsistent with the divine justice wholly to remit that punishment, where there is a weighty cause for it; If it may be appeas'd by such a punishment as carries in it a sufficient testimony of his displeasure at the offence by which it was provok'd; How much more by a satisfaction, yea such a one as is not only of the same dismal nature with that which is due unto it, but is in truth equivalent to it? Unless perhaps it should be thought to insist upon the paying of it by that person by whom it was injur'd and provok'd. But as it may very well be wonder'd at, that they, who think it no way inconsistent with Gods justice to pardon the sins of mankind without any satisfaction, should think it to be some detriment to it to pardon

pardon with one though by another ; so it is not easy to apprehend what necessity there is in order to the appeasing of the divine justice, that the person offending should be alway the party suffering. Is it that the displeasure of God is not thereby sufficiently declar'd against the offence, because not touching him by whom the offence is committed ? But it must be allow'd so to be, if the person who undertakes the punishment be infinitely superiour to all those for whom he undertook : The least touch of such a person being a more *honourable amends* than a more intense and more lasting punishment of the other ? Is it then that though other debts may both be transfer'd upon and discharged by another, yet sin as being a personal debt cannot ? But neither doth satisfaction imply any such translation or discharge, but on the contrary, the offering of something else instead of it, and which through the acceptance of the party to whom it is tender'd avails to the others release. Is it lastly, that it is unlawful for God either to require or accept the punishment of one for another, and therefore no likely way to appease a provoked justice ? But as I will not much insist upon the lawfulness of the former of these because I am not well assur'd of it my self, so I see no reason at all to question the lawfulness of the other. For if *Volenti non fiat injuria*, it can be no offence at all to punish him for anothers offence who freely and unconstrainedly offers himself to undergo it. All therefore that will be requisite for us to do is to shew what appearance there is of our Saviours so answering the demands of the divine justice, which accordingly I come now to evince.

3. I have said what is to be said upon the principles of reason concerning the necessity or at least congruity of a satisfaction to the divine justice, and thereby made the belief of it so much the more easy to be receiv'd. Proceed we now to consider what evidence we have from the declarations of God of its being actually accomplished, and particularly by him to whom our religion prompts us to ascribe it. For as what is done or not done for, or to the satisfaction of God, cannot so well be judg'd of by reason, as by his own declarations concerning it ; so much less as to the manner wherein it is affirmed to have been done, and as to the person to whom it is ascribed : Because how meet soever we may judge this or that way of procedure, yet there may be others as apt, and which God therefore might take toward the effecting of it. It is the affirmation of Christianity, or at least as it hath been commonly understood, that to make way for that pardon of sin which God was ready enough to impart, but which his justice could not well assent to till a reparation had first been made to it, God gave and the Son of God came to suffer in himself for our sins, and to satisfy that his injur'd justice for us. What evidence there is of this gracious design in the Scriptures of the New Testament shall by and by be declar'd, and every part and particle thereof evidenced from them. But it seems to me not to be despis'd, that by the institution of God Sacrifices have all along been offered to appease him, and yet notwithstanding that institution of his spoken contemptibly of by himself. For if nothing more were wanting toward the atoning of the Divine Majesty than our own repentance and contrition, how came Sacrifices to be tender'd ? And if such Sacrifices as were then tender'd might suffice, why did God sometimes speak so slightly of them, and even condemn the offering of them ? were it not that he intended that men should look through those sacrifices to a much better and more valuable satisfaction. Neither will it  
avail



<sup>1</sup> Pſal. 51. 16,  
17.

<sup>2</sup> Pſal. 40. 6.

avail to ſay that where God depreſſes the offering of ſacrifices, it is for the moſt part in compariſon of, and to prompt men to that of a *Contrite heart*, which is therefore by the Prophet *David* <sup>1</sup> affirm'd to be the more acceptable one. For as his own appointment of ſacrifices for an attonement ſhews them not to have been without their uſe towards it, as well as, though not in the ſame degree with, the ſacrifice of a *broken heart*; So by how much the leſs valuable they were in themſelves (as certainly they were not much if they were inferior to our contrition) ſo much the more reaſon is there to believe that they were intended to remit men to *another* and a *more valuable* ſacrifice: Eſpecially if it may alſo appear that upon their inability to appeaſe God <sup>m</sup>, God propos'd and the Son of God undertook the offering of another ſacrifice. For how can we well think the ſatisfaction of Chriſt to be other than neceſſary, when we find God paſſing from the requiring of ordinary ſacrifices to that of the body of our Saviour? Or think that ſacrifice of his body, not to have been intended under the other, when notwithstanding his declaration of having no *pleaſure* at all in them, he did yet, till the coming of the other, continue them in the world? For being men were ſo apt to reſt in thoſe legal ſacrifices even to the neglect of that of a contrite heart, there was ſtill the more reaſon to have taken them away; neither can we imagine but that God, who took no pleaſure at all in them, would therefore either have never inſtituted them or ſooner remov'd them, were it not that they might ſerve to the world as a proof of his requiring ſome other ſatisfaction for our offences than what our own contrition could make him, and an emblem of that better ſacrifice and ſatisfaction which was in due time to be offer'd to him.

<sup>1</sup> Rom. 6. 23.

<sup>2</sup> Rom. 5. 12.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Pet. 2. 22.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Cor. 5. 21.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Pet. 2. 22.

<sup>1</sup> Heb. 4. 15.

For the evidencing whereof out of the Scriptures of the New Teſtament eſpecially, as which are the proper Store-houſes of ſuch proofs, I will firſt of all conſider of what they affirm concerning the Original of death, and then of what they affirm of the Death of Chriſt. For if, as the Scripture <sup>a</sup> assures us, *Death* be the *wages of ſin*, if, as the ſame Scriptures <sup>o</sup> assure us, *Death entered by ſin*, and *ſo paſſed upon all men for that all have ſinned*; what account can be given of that of our Saviour, ſuppoſing it not to have been the chaſtiſement of *our ſin*, and ſo a ſatisfaction to the Divine Juſtice for it? For being, as the ſame Scripture affirms, he himſelf was devoid of ſin, as having not ſo much as any *deceit* or *guile* <sup>p</sup> in his mouth; Being ſin was a thing which he *neither* <sup>q</sup> *knew* nor <sup>r</sup> *did*, yea which at the ſame time he choſe to be like us *in all other things*; <sup>1</sup> he carefully avoided an imitation of; Either he was not chaſtned for ſin at all, which the forementioned texts forbid us to believe, or he was chaſtned for ours. Neither will it avail to ſay that thoſe texts are to be underſtood of meer men like our ſelves, or at leaſt of the natural deſcendants of *Adam*, and therefore not to be extended unto Chriſt, who as he was more than a man, ſo was none of his natural offspring. For as I do not pretend to argue from the letter of thoſe texts, which I acknowledge doth not concern Chriſt, nor can be ſuppos'd to do unleſs he were guilty of ſin himſelf, but from the reaſon they give us to believe the like to have been the cauſe of the death of Chriſt; So it is not eaſy to conceive, how, when ſin gave occaſion to the death of us, it could come to be inflicted upon him, who was ſo far ſuperiour to us, without any conſideration of it: Eſpecially when (as I ſhall afterwards ſhew) he is not only affirmed to have *died for our ſins*, but to be *made ſin* <sup>2</sup> *for us*, that we might be made

<sup>2</sup> 2 Cor. 5. 21.

made the righteousness of God in him. For what less can that expression import, than that death came upon him also by occasion of Sin, but which was rather laid upon him by God, than contracted by himself? But because even this, how clear soever, may stand in need of some light after the Mists that the *Socinians* have cast about it, therefore proceed we in the next place to what the Scripture affirms concerning the death of Christ, as which will bring us yet more near to our intentment. For not only is he affirmed to die for us and for our sins, but so as to give his life both as a sacrifice and a ransom for us, yea enable God, without any impeachment of his justice, to proceed to the justification of us. Of our Saviours dying for us that one text of St. Paul <sup>a</sup> may suffice, <sup>b</sup> Rom. 5. 7, 8: where he argues the great love of God in it from the little likelihood there is of such a charity in the world. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die; yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us. For beside that the word <sup>c</sup> we render <sup>d</sup> ὑπὲρ for neither is, nor can be deny'd to signifie sometimes in our place and stead, because manifestly so us'd by St. Paul in his Epistle to Philemon <sup>e</sup>, <sup>f</sup> Philem. 13. what sense can we with more reason impose upon it here, when it is immediately after affirmed that we are justified by the blood <sup>g</sup> that was shed <sup>h</sup> in it, as, in the next verse <sup>i</sup> again that we are reconciled to God by it? <sup>j</sup> Rom. 5. 9. — 10. Justification and reconciliation by means of anothers dying for us importing his absolving us from our punishment in consideration of that of another, which is not certainly much different from his dying in our place or stead. And though I am not so happy as to be master of many books, and much less of the commentaries of the *Socinians* (if yet they have ventur'd to write any continued one) yet if we may judge any thing by the Posthumous Annotations of *Grotius* which, by what means soever it was, are sufficiently leaven'd with their notions, they might have seen something more in the forequoted passage of St. Paul, than they were willing to allow in the death of Christ. For how otherwise comes the story of *Damon* and *Pythias* to be represented among the rare examples of men's being willing to lay down their lives for, and instead of one another, if it be so hard a thing to believe that Christ died in our stead? For one of them offer'd himself so far to danger for the other, as to offer to die for him, if he return'd not at the time appointed, and the other as readily requited his kindness by returning soon enough to free him from it. Sure I am the Socinian sense cannot so easily be put upon that passage of our Saviour, where he professeth himself ready to lay down his life for his sheep <sup>k</sup>. For being compar'd with what goes before concerning the hire-<sup>l</sup> ling, who, when he sees a wolf coming, leaves his sheep to his mercy, it shews him ready enough to die to free them from death, and to die in their place or stead. If therefore (as appears from the foregoing instance) that be no improper sense of Christ's dying for us, I would fain know why it should not have place in that passage of St. Paul to the Romans, where Christ is moreover said so to die for us, that we are thereupon justified by God, and so freed by his sufferings from our own. The next expression to be considered is Christ's dying, for or because of our sins (for so it is also expressed <sup>m</sup>) and which one would think, because <sup>n</sup> Rom. 4. 25. the procuring cause of sufferings, to have been so of those of Christ, because <sup>ο</sup> διὰ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα <sup>π</sup> ἡμῶν. said to be undergone for them. Where, omitting other places, I shall <sup>q</sup> take notice of that of St. Paul <sup>r</sup> where he affirms that Christ died for our <sup>s</sup> 1 Cor. 15. 3. sins

*sins according to the scriptures* : Not for any information that text of it self will afford us, but for that scripture of the old Testament to which it sends us, and where, if any where, it is to be found, even the *fifty third chapter of Isay*. For there indeed it is affirmed, but no where else so clearly, that he was *stricken* <sup>e</sup> *for the transgression* of the people, as a little before <sup>f</sup>, that *he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and by his stripes we were healed*. For however we might possibly think that expression of dying for our Sins to be capable of signifying what the Socinians impose upon it, that is to say, his dying to assure us of the truth of that pardon of sin which he promulg'd, or to draw us from the commission of it; Yet is it possible to think it design'd there, when, the better to let us know what he means by being *wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities*, he adds that *the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and by his stripes we are healed* ? For this shews manifestly that dying or suffering for our sins, is suffering the chastisement of them, and so bringing peace and reconciliation to us. A thing which the same Prophet doth yet more confirm, when he subjoins <sup>g</sup>, that *all we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own ways, and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all*. For what more could be said to shew, that his punishments were the *chastisement* of our iniquities; and if so, and accepted too (as appears by their bringing peace to us) a satisfaction to God both for us and them? And here very opportunely comes in the mention of Christs giving himself a *sacrifice* <sup>h</sup> for us, yea a *propitiatory* <sup>i</sup> one, or one by which *atonement* was made. For when I can read that the blood which was shed upon the altar was given to *make an atonement* <sup>k</sup> *for mens souls*, that is to say, to appease God toward them, and prompt him to *forgive them their sins*, which is particularly remembered <sup>l</sup> as the effect of this atonement; when I can read farther concerning those sacrifices that they were given to *bear the iniquity* <sup>m</sup> *of the people*, which is sufficiently known in the Hebrew Idiom to signifie <sup>n</sup> the bearing of the punishment thereof, I cannot but wonder (and should more, unless I knew the force of prejudice) to see it deni'd that the death of Christ was intended to satisfy an offended justice, and procure our impunity by his sufferings. For is it that the things before affirmed cannot be verified of the death of Christ, whatever they may be of other Sacrifices? But of him it is also said that he was made a *Sacrifice* yea a *propitiatory* one for sin, that God did *lay upon him*, and he *bear* our iniquities. Is it then that the things affirm'd of Sacrifices do not import as much as we pretend to infer from them? But neither of that can any doubt be made, if we consider those Sacrifices as substituted in the place of the offerers, or as a satisfaction to the divine justice by the offering of them. That they were substituted in the place of the offerers, their *bearing the iniquity* of the offerers, and the *pardon* of the offerers thereupon shew: And that they were intended also as a satisfaction to God's offended justice is as clear from their appeasing of him, and Gods pardoning the offerers thereupon. For as we are not to imagine any other Anger in God than what he is prompted to by his Vindictive justice, so we may well imagine both the one and the other satisfied, when he accords the offerers of them the forgiveness of their iniquities: Whether it were as to civil and temporary punishments, which indeed was the only <sup>o</sup> thing those

<sup>e</sup> Isa. 53. 8.<sup>f</sup> — 5.<sup>g</sup> — 6.<sup>h</sup> Eph. 5. 2.<sup>i</sup> 1 Joh. 2. 2.

— 4. 10.

<sup>k</sup> Lev. 17. 11.<sup>l</sup> Lev. 5--10.<sup>m</sup> 13.<sup>n</sup> Lev. 10. 17.<sup>o</sup> Ezc. 18. 20.<sup>p</sup> Heb. 10. 4.  
comp. with -- 5.  
<sup>q</sup> 13. Vid. &  
Grot. de satisf.  
Christi, Cap. 10.



those Sacrifices of themselves could do, or as to eternal ones also in the vertue of that Sacrifice which they were intended as a type of, and to which (as I have before shewn) they were designed to remit men. Since therefore the intention of all propitiatory sacrifices was to satisfy in some measure an offended justice; Since our Saviours death was not only a propitiatory Sacrifice, but infinitely preferable to all legal ones, it is but reasonable to believe, especially when we find God granting pardon thereupon, that he was satisfied by it, which is the thing we were to demonstrate from it. But so also will it be found, that Christ gave his life a *ransom* for us, as well as for a *sacrifice*, which will give a yet firmer establishment to that satisfaction which we propugne: As will appear if we consider it as a *ransom for us* or *in our stead*, or as a *valuable* and *sufficient* one. For not only is it affirmed that *Christ gave himself for us to redeem* or *ransome us* <sup>P</sup>, which they, who would under-stand nothing else thereby than a bare freedom, may perhaps find somewhat to oppose against, but by our Saviour himself <sup>q</sup>, that he came to give his life *λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν*, a *ransom for or instead of many*, as by St. Paul in one word <sup>r</sup> that he gave himself *ἀντὶ λυτροῦ ὑπὲρ πάντων*, a *ransom both for and instead of all*. For besides that the word *λύτρον*, of which it is compos'd, signifies properly a *price* <sup>t</sup>, and particularly that price which was paid for the *redemption of Captives*; besides that St. Peter <sup>u</sup> doth manifestly use it in this sense, when he not only compares our redemption by the blood of Christ to that which is made by *silver and gold*, but affirms that *blood by which we were redeem'd* to exceed the other as it is the *price* of any thing; There is a particular force in the preposition *ἀντὶ*, and which it will not be so easy to put by. For there being (as *Grotius* <sup>\*</sup> hath observ'd) but two significations of the preposition *ἀντὶ* in composition, to wit either of contrariety or commutation, and the former of these having no place here, as being given not against us but for us, nothing else can be supposed to be understood, than that what was given or laid down by Christ, was intended in the *stead* of us and of our punishment. A notion which, as the same *Grotius* <sup>\*</sup> hath well observ'd, is yet farther confirm'd by another passage of St. Paul <sup>y</sup>, and where he speaks the same language; it being there affirm'd by him that *Christ redeem'd* or *bought us off from the curse by being made a curse for us*. All therefore that remains for us to do, is to shew this price to have been a valuable one, and such as might pass even in an unprejudiced estimate for a sufficient compensation for those punishments for which it was laid down. A thing evident enough from that epithet of *pretious* which is bestow'd upon it, but will be rendered yet more evident from the quality of the person to whom it is entitled, and from what is said concerning those prices which were paid under the Law for the redemption of men from punishment, I mean the Sacrifices that were offered under it. For how could that blood be said to be *pretious* or valuable, which did not answer the value of the thing for which it was laid down? Even that, which is otherwise pretious, or valuable, having nothing of pretiousness in this respect, if it do not bear a proportion to that for which it was paid. As in truth, what may not that be able to answer, which was not only as St. Peter <sup>z</sup> speaks, the *blood of a Lamb without spot or blemish*, but, as St. Paul <sup>a</sup>, the *blood of God*? For as for those who would derive the value of it from the immenseness or infiniteness of his sufferings, rather than from the quality of the

Tit. 2. 14.

Mat. 20. 28.

1 Tim. 2. 6.

Hesych. Λύ-

τρον, τιμημα.

Hesych. Λύ-

τρα, καδάε-

ματα, λυτή-

ρια και σάντα

τά δίδόμενα εις

ανάλησιν [ση

ανάκτησιν]

ἀνδραπάν.

1 Pet. 1. 18.

De satisfact.

Christi, c. 8.

De satisf. ib.

Gal. 3. 13.

1 Pet. 1. 19.

Act. 20. 28:

person suffering; beside that they depart in this particular from the language of the Scripture, which (as you saw but now) founds it upon the dignity of his person, and not upon any supposed infiniteness in his sufferings, they forget those sufferings of his to be subjected in a finite nature, and which therefore cannot be supposed to be infinite. For *whatsoever is receiv'd being receiv'd according to the capacity of that which doth receive it*, if the nature suffering be finite, the sufferings must be also such, and accordingly not to be accounted of as infinite, but in respect of the union of the nature suffering to the person of him who was infinite, and so infinite rather in their value than in their intenseness. That of the *Author to the Hebrews* <sup>b</sup> shall put a period to that value which we attribute to the sufferings of our Saviour. For to what purpose was it alledg'd by him, that it was not *possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin*, if the blood of Christ, which was upon that occasion substituted in the room of them, could not do it, nay if it could not do it by its own intrinsick worth, and so dispose God to the removal of it? For if the acceptance of the Almighty were the only ground of its value, the blood of Bulls and of Goats might have done it as well as the blood of Christ, because capable of the like acceptation from him.

<sup>b</sup> Heb. 10. 4, 5.

<sup>c</sup> De Satisfact.  
Christi, c. 6.

And here very opportunely comes in the consideration of a very material question, and which, whether through the dulness of my understanding or the difficulty of the thing it self, gave me more trouble than the consideration of all other things appertaining to this Argument. For supposing not only a satisfaction made, but a valuable one, or (as our *Church*, agreeably to the foregoing discourse, and the doctrine of the Scripture, expresseth it) a *full, perfect, and sufficient one*; And supposing farther, that this so valuable and perfect satisfaction is accepted, what right can there be in God to clog it with other conditions, and particularly with the faith and repentance of those persons, for whose benefit it was both tender'd and accepted? On the one hand it seem'd but reasonable (as *Grotius* <sup>c</sup> hath observed, and accordingly argued) that every one should have a power of imposing laws upon those actions of his which depend upon his own will, and consequently, that, it being in the power of God either to accept or refuse a satisfaction, it should be lawful for him either to grant the benefit thereof presently or after a certain time, and either with or without any farther conditions. On the other hand, it seem'd as reasonable to me, that if he did accept of the satisfaction offer'd, he should accept of it purely and without any conditions; Especially considering it as a valuable one, and such as is a sufficient compensation for those evils we had deserved. For if it be a valuable compensation, why should God require any thing more, nay how can he in justice, if he accept of it, but accept of it as such, and accordingly without any farther conditions impart the benefit thereof to those for whom it was accepted? For though it be in his power either to accept it, or not, because our sufferings, and not the sufferings underwent were the things under obligation; Yet certainly not to accept it, and yet at the same time clog it with other conditions: The valuableness of the thing accepted, forbidding the requiring of any thing more, as which doth secretly but certainly overthrow it. To deliver my self from these streits, I enquired first of all, whether a difference ought not to be made between those satisfactions that are made by the offending party, and those that are made by another for him; There seeming to be something of reason to require something of the Offending

sending party, when the satisfaction was made not by himself but by another. But beside that to give efficacy to it, something also was requir'd of Christ, and particularly his pleading that satisfaction and interceding for us in vertue of it; if the satisfaction be plenary and accepted, it matters not at all by whom it was made; the plenariness of the satisfaction being that which we argue from, and therefore being of like force wheresoever it is to be found. This first enquiry not succeeding, I considered next, whether supposing our Saviour to tender it, not as to take place presently, but upon the performance of certain conditions by the persons for whom it was intended, it might not be lawful for him, to whom it was tender'd, not to give it any other force, than he, by whom it was tender'd, did desire: There being no inconvenience at all for him, who tenders a satisfaction, to pray the acceptance of it in their *only* behalf who shall approve themselves meet objects of it by their repentance toward God, and Faith towards himself; and therefore neither for God, so to bound and limit the effects of it. For neither is any injury thereby done to Christ or his satisfaction, as with whose desires in it God doth only comply, nor yet to those persons for whom it was tender'd, because tender'd only upon such and such conditions for them. But neither could I rest wholly here, because it appears by the Psalmist<sup>d</sup>, that as the father is first in the order of nature, so the first motion of this satisfaction came from him to whom it was tender'd, and Christ did but fulfil the *will* of the father in it. There was therefore a necessity of having recourse to a third consideration, but which the foregoing one gave me not a little insight into. For if it were but congruous to the greatness as well as to the holiness of the divine nature, to preserve in the minds of men *some* reverence both of himself and benefits, and particularly in the minds of those whom he had made the object of so great a favour (for otherwise, men might have taken occasion from this, to have indulg'd to the dishonour of him, as we see those have been apt enough to do, who have been willing to believe that Christ hath done all for them) neither ought we to wonder, that God should, notwithstanding a satisfaction, require of us in order to our actual justification, repentance toward himself and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ: Partly because neither should we have intended these, if we had been secure of not suffering by the want of them; and partly because these are the *lowest instances* we can give of the regard we have for him against whom we have offended, but by whom we are also put into a capacity of being sav'd, and therefore *also* such, as we cannot think the honour of God could well dispense with, any more than with the omission of a satisfaction. For being things which his own holiness and greatness made it but congruous to him to require, either the satisfaction tender'd was not at all to be accepted by him, or it was only so to be accepted that no prejudice should accrue to Gods greatness and holiness, any more than to his offended justice. Though these conditions will appear yet more reasonable, if we consider them, I do not say as also the means of obtaining eternal life (because even that was merited by the same death which satisfied for our offences) but as *perform'd by the vertue of that Grace* which Christs death did procure, and *with regard to those many infirmities that adhere to them*. For well may we think that satisfaction no way prejudic'd by the conditions which are requir'd of us, when the performance of them is not only the fruit of that grace which it did procure, but attended with such infirmities as make them stand in need of a satisfaction

<sup>d</sup> Psa. 40. 6. &c.



faction themselves. Not less congruous I no way doubt were the things God requir'd or rather desir'd of our Saviour himself, to give force to the satisfaction he had made. But beside that *that* will fall in more aptly, when I come to the consideration of those actions of his which followed upon his death; It may be enough to us that this whole business was transacted with the free consent of him, by whom this satisfaction was made, and therefore no injury offered by them, either to it or him.

I will conclude this discourse concerning the truth of our Saviours satisfaction, when I have added to the foregoing consideration this very material one; That Christ is not only affirm'd to have died for us and for our sins, as that too both for a Sacrifice and a ransom, but so as to enable God without any impeachment of his justice to proceed to the justification of us. For what other can we make of those words of St. Paul, where he tells us, that God *hath set forth Christ to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for or rather by reason of the passing by of transgressions through the forbearance of God. To declare I say at this time his righteousness, that he might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.* For is it that we ought to understand by *righteousness* the goodness of God, as the *Posthumous Annotations* of Grotius, in a direct contradiction to his more allowed one in his life time, would have it understood? But beside that *that* is both the less proper and less usual sense of the word *righteousness*, and therefore not without great reason to be pitch'd upon; There are many things in the text to determine it to the other and more proper, and from which therefore we ought not lightly to depart. For first of all (as the forequoted Grotius<sup>b</sup> hath very well observed) the mention of the *declaration of Gods righteousness* is immediately subjoin'd to that of his *blood*; and that *propitiation* which he had made by it. For the immediate design of propitiatory Sacrifices being to *bear the sins* of those for whom they are pretended to be offered, and so dispose God to grant remission of them; What can we well understand by that *righteousness* of God (for the *declaration* whereof this of Christ is said to have been made) but that *righteousness* of God which is conversant about the exacting of punishments, and which by the propitiation offer'd, was not only appeased, but made to appear yet more clearly than it had before done, because shewing him not to have had a design of passing over the sins of the world without an atonement for them? The same is yet more evident from the opposition that is there made between Gods *before passing by* the sins of men *through the forbearance* of God, and the *declaration of his present righteousness*. For what occasion could Gods passing by the sins of foregoing ages give to the suspecting of his goodness, that God should now take occasion from thence to declare it anew, as that too by the setting forth of a propitiation? For even that *passing by* of sins was a confirmation of it, and no doubt dispos'd the world to such a belief of it, as not to be much afraid of receiving the due reward of them. Which as it therefore makes it less reasonable to understand the *goodness* of God, which is the only thing that can be pretended to overthrow the proper and literal sense of *righteousness*, so doth therefore oblige us to adjoin our selves to this, and with which all the circumstances of the text do so aptly conspire. For whereas by God's so easily passing by the sins of foregoing ages, some question might well be made concerning that righteousness of God which is conversant about the punishing of sin, there could

<sup>a</sup> Rom. 3. 25, 26.

<sup>c</sup> Διὰ τὴν παράκλησιν αὐτοῦ, &c.

<sup>b</sup> Vid. Grot. de satisfact. Christi cap. 1.

<sup>d</sup> Grot. ibid.

could now be no longer doubt of it, when they saw the Son of God made a propitiation for it, as that propitiation too not imparted without the faith of those for whom it was offered, and that piety and vertue which it did either include or infer: This bespeaking not an easy and ositant passing by of sins, but a due and serious consideration of them, yea even in those persons to whom he intended to remit them.

4. Now as after I have shewn what appearance there is from the Scriptures of our Saviour's answering the demands of the divine justice, nothing remains for us to enquire but what the *consequents* of that satisfaction are; so if our enquiry respect God, we shall find the *consequents* thereof to be the both disposing and obliging him, considering the agreement that past between them, to admit all mankind to pardon upon the performance of certain conditions by them. That I say *only dispose*, unless it be with respect to the agreement that past between them, is because, the satisfaction tender'd being not the thing that was under obligation, it was in the power of God either to accept or refuse it. But that I say at all *dispose*, is because of the value of the satisfaction offered, and the amends it was apt to make to an offended Justice; Such a satisfaction, where there wants not mercy to accept it, having enough in it to incline the person to whom it is tender'd, to receive it. But as to make it certainly efficacious, there must be either some precedent compact, or a present acceptation of it, so after that whether compact or acceptation it is certainly available to all those purposes, for which it was so agreed of or accepted: He, to whom it is tender'd, thereby obliging himself, and being not therefore in a capacity of departing from it. All therefore that will remain for us to enquire is, what appearance there is of any such compact, or acceptation, or both, and to what purposes it was so agreed of and accepted. Of the compact that was made concerning it, the *Psal-mist* will not suffer us to doubt, especially if we take in the comment of the Author to the Hebrews<sup>k</sup>. For it appearing from the one and the other, that upon the ineffectualness of Sacrifices to appease God and to take away sin, God propos'd and prepar'd, and the Son of God consented to the taking of a *body* to make an offering of it for that end, there will not only appear a compact concerning it, but one also of the most forcible ones; because the proposal of the compact began from him to whom the satisfaction was to be tender'd, and who therefore must be suppos'd to be bound so much the faster by it, because giving beginning to, as well as consenting to it. The evidence will be yet more clear for God's accepting of it afterwards, because so clearly as well as universally attest-ed to by the Scripture; That not only representing Christ as one in *whom he was well pleased*<sup>l</sup>, yea so declar'd by a voice from Heaven, but as <sup>l</sup> Mat. 3. 17. one whom he himself had not only *set forth for a propitiation through faith in his blood*, and so that he might be able to *justify* those that believe in him, but *in whom God*<sup>m</sup> *was reconciling the world unto him-self, not imputing their trespasses unto them*. For which cause the same <sup>m</sup> 2 Cor. 5. 19. Apostle doth afterwards<sup>n</sup> represent himself and other the *Ambassadors* <sup>n</sup> — 26. of Christ as authorized by God as well as Christ to *pray* and *beseech* men *to be reconciled unto God*. Which as it is a manifest argument of God's accepting of Christ's satisfaction for those merciful purposes for which it was tender'd, so shews also that God was not thereby actually reconciled to the world, but only so far as to be ready to admit men to pardon upon the performance of those conditions under which he accepted of Christ's satisfaction,

satisfaction, and so, as the same Apostle speaks, *reconciling themselves to God*. For wherefore else did God commit the ministry of reconciliation to the Apostles, or use such entreaties to persuade the world to it? Both the one and the other being of no use, if men's reconciliation were accomplished without them, and by the sole and immediate influence of that satisfaction which had been tender'd.

But from hence we may also collect what are the consequences of that satisfaction as to us, and which the want of consideration of hath, it may be more than any thing else, made men restrain it to the elect, contrary both to the doctrine of our Church and of the Scripture. For as the late Reverend *Primate of Armagh* hath well observed, men are not actually sav'd by the satisfaction of Christ, but only put into a capacity of Salvation by it. Which is farther evident from hence, that though we are said to be *justified by Christ's blood*, yet not simply as either offered or accepted, but as applied to us by that faith, which the Gospel doth both commend and enjoin; As will appear not only from those many texts of Scripture which affirm us to be *justified by faith*, and to which it may be our justification is as often attributed as to the blood of Christ, but from that known place of *St. Paul*, and from which I before prov'd an amends

\* True intent and extent of Christ's death, &c. and An answer to some exceptions against it.

† Rom. 5. 9.

† Rom. 3. 25.

\* Answer to some exceptions, &c.

† Second Sermon on the Passion, p. 186, 187.

† Rom. 10. 4.

made to the divine justice: That telling us in express terms that though God hath *set forth his Son to be a propitiation for us*, yet it is *through faith in his blood*, and as that blood is both appli'd and made effectual by it. Agreeably not only to that saying of *Prosper* quoted by the fore-mentioned *Primate*, *Habet quidem in se [nempe sanguis Christi] ut omnibus prosit, sed si non bibitur non medetur*, but also to the both language and doctrine of the Church of England: The words of one of its *Homilies* being, that as it *profiteth a man nothing to have salve, unless it be appli'd to the part affected*: So the death of Christ shall stand us in no force, unless we apply it to our selves in such sort as God hath appointed. Not that it was without an ability to procure our welfare, or not intended by God and Christ for it (for the same *Homily* doth just before instruct us that it was *given for the health and salvation of our souls*) but that as God commonly worketh by means, so in this thing he hath also ordain'd a certain mean whereby we may reap the fruit of it. Which mean after it hath both affirmed and proved to be *faith*, it concludeth with those very pertinent words of *St. Paul*, that *Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth*; so restraining the actual benefit of Christ to such only as do believe, as those words of our Saviour do yet more clearly, which though attributing Salvation to him that believeth and is baptized, yet affirm in express terms that *he that believeth not shall be damned*. But may we not also vouch both the Authority of our Church and Scripture for Christ's putting all men into a capacity of Salvation as well as God's elect? May we not affirm that satisfaction of his both to dispose and oblige God, considering the agreement that was made between them, to be in a readiness to receive all men to pardon upon performance of the conditions requir'd? If we may not, what means that Church of ours, when in its Explication of that part of the Creed which respects the Son of God it prompts the *Catechumen* to make answer, that he learns from thence to *believe in God the Son who hath redeemed him and all mankind*? For however those comprehensive words may be sometime thought to intend the world of God's elect, yet certainly not so, when they are set to distinguish the object of redemption,



demption, as from that more general one of *creation*, so also from that more restrained one of *sanctification*: That being a manifest indication, that as the object of *redemption* is not so general as that of *creation*, so it is of a more comprehensive nature than that of *sanctification*, which is confined to the Catechumen and *the elect people of God*. Conformable hereto are other the Monuments of the Church of *England*, and particularly both its Articles and Homilies. For as the *former* <sup>a</sup> of these affirms that *perfect redemption, propitiation and satisfaction*, which Christ made once for all, to have been *for all the sins of the whole world both original and actual*, so the *latter* <sup>x</sup>, after it had enquir'd to whom God gave that singular token of his love, his Son, makes answer that he gave him *to the whole world, that is to say, to Adam, and all that should come after him*. Which is certainly something more than to *all Gods elect*, yea as many of humane nature as the world either hath or shall contain. As indeed how otherwise could the Church have kept to the doctrine of the Scriptures, by which both it and all other Churches ought to regulate their belief? For supposing *first* our first Parents to have been the *representatives* of mankind, as all men are willing to believe when they come to discourse concerning those commands that were laid upon them, and much more when they come to discourse concerning that Original corruption which we traduc'd from them: And what should hinder us to believe that they were in like manner representatives as to those gracious promises that were made to them, and particularly concerning *the seed of the woman*? There being certainly as much reason for the one as for the other, but in this respect somewhat more, in that the promise whereof we speak was intended both to raise them who had but now fallen, and abate the pride of him by whom they had been overthrown. For how had the promised remedy been a due consolation to our first Parents, if they could have thought that so great a number of those, who should descend from them, should have been left without all possibility of recovering by it? Or how a due mortification of the Devil, who was secur'd so far from the power of that Seed that was to oppose him, that it should not contribute at all to the recovery of many of those whom he had overthrown in our first Parents, and over whom therefore his former conquest must have been so far compleat? But not any longer to insist upon that promise to our first Parents, though it seems not only to be of force, but to have been both thought so, and alluded to by the forementioned Homily, when it affirms God to have given Christ *to Adam, and to all that should come after him*, consider we in the next place of those texts of Scripture, which affirm this Jesus of ours to have been a *propitiation for the sins of the whole world*, with other expressions of that nature. For beside that such expressions ought to be allow'd their natural force, unless some very great and manifest reason appeared to restrain them, I would fain know, as the forementioned *Primate* <sup>z</sup> hath no less honestly than rationally argued, how could those, to whom the voice of the Gospel hath come, be otherwise obliged to believe in him, or condemned for the disbelief of him? Which yet that they are, that of our Saviour <sup>a</sup> may serve for a proof, where he entreats of God's great love to the world in giving his Son for it; because not only affirming that *he that believeth in him is not condemned*, but *he that believeth not is condemn'd already*. For what is there that both parties do more agree in than that the belief requir'd by Christ, is the belief of his being a Saviour, yea of our selves? Nay how can we exclude that from being a part of that belief, for the want whereof

<sup>a</sup> Art. 31.<sup>x</sup> Second Sermon of the Passion, pag. 185.<sup>y</sup> Gen. 3. 15.<sup>z</sup> Answer to some exceptions, &c.<sup>a</sup> Joh. 3. 18.

b—17.

c—16.

whereof it is that men are said to be condemned? When it is affirmed in the verse before, that *God sent not his son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved*<sup>b</sup>, as again in the verse before that<sup>c</sup>, that *God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life*. For what belief in or concerning Christ can we suppose afterwards intended, than the belief of the doctrine there delivered concerning him, and particularly concerning the Salvation there declar'd, as that again, so as to trust in him or give up our selves to be governed by him? And how can any man do that, who doth not first of all believe that he is put into a capacity of receiving Salvation by him, as how should he, who doth not believe that he offered himself for him? For neither can any man be actually sav'd, who was not before in a capacity of being so, nor therefore rely upon another for it, or give up himself to his service in order to it, who is not before perswaded of the other. I must not so dismiss the words but now referr'd to, though I have inferred as much from them, as may serve to establish the foregoing argument. For if we look more nearly into them we shall find them to contain a more direct proof of that universal redemption which we propugn. For what world was that which God so loved, as to give his Son for it, but the world in its most general sense, and as comprehending in it both those that believe, and those that believe not? Nay is not that sufficiently intimated when Christ affirms the end of God's giving him to have been, that *whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life*? He who speaks of those in it who do believe, supposing that there are others who believe not, and consequently that God both had a kindness to, and gave his Son for that world, which yet should not in all its members make use of, or receive benefit by him. Now what kindness could there be to the world in the thus giving of his Son, if they were not put into a capacity by it, of receiving pardon and everlasting life from him? In like manner, when it is afterwards affirm'd, that *God sent not his son into the world, to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved*, can we with reason understand any other world, than that spoken of in the former verse, nay is there not enough in those very words to oblige us so to interpret it? For was it only into the Society of such as should believe that our Saviour was sent? Nay doth not St. John complain<sup>d</sup> that *he came into the world and the world knew him not*, yea to those of it who were more peculiarly *his own*, but many of those *his own* received him not? And is there any reason then to believe, that he meant any other world there, than that which comprehended both sorts of men? Or, believing it, but that we ought still to understand the same world, when he affirms that *he was sent that it might be saved by him*? Especially, when he afterwards<sup>e</sup> affirms, that *this is the condemnation that light is come into the world, but men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil*. For as there is little appearance of understanding the world there spoken of in any other sense than that which is both the most general and natural, so much less of excluding any from a capacity of receiving benefit by it: The condemnation here spoken of being, that though *light was come into*, and no doubt shone unto them (for otherwise it had been as none) yet there were those who disregarded it, yea preferred *darkness* before it. Now what presumption

<sup>d</sup> Joh. 1. 10, 11.<sup>e</sup> Joh. 3. 19.

tion

tion could there be of this Son of God's being sent either to save the world or enlighten it, if he who is affirmed to have been so sent, did not contribute so far towards it, as to put them into a capacity of receiving benefit by it? So hard or rather impossible is it, if we have a due regard unto the Scripture, not to believe all men whatsoever to have had an interest in our Saviours death so far, as to be put into a capacity of receiving Salvation by it: And if so, men ought to be wary how they go about to deny it unless they mean in some measure, as we know who laid <sup>f</sup>, to *deny the Lord that bought us.*

<sup>f</sup> 2 Pet. 2. 14

4. I have dwelt somewhat long upon the satisfaction of Christ, that most important as well as most controverted *end* of our Saviours death, but I will endeavour to make amends for it in my consideration of those that follow. As well I may, when I have upon the matter prevented my self already, in shewing it to have been one *end* of our Saviours death, to demerit Gods love to us as well as to appease him, and prompt him to bestow eternal life, as well as free us from his displeasure. For how can we well think otherwise, when we find that *God so loved the world that he himself gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth in him should have eternal life*, as well as be free from that sad death which they had deserv'd? For neither can we doubt of Gods accepting of what he did for that end, who himself gave him for it, nor yet that the blood of so *immaculate a lamb*, yea of one who was also *God*, could be answered, to its worth, by a readiness in the Divine Majesty, to grant men a simple pardon of their offences.

5. But because how ready soever God may be to give pardon and eternal life in consideration of our Saviours death, yet it is only to such men who are thereby induc'd to repent of their sins, and give themselves up to him by whom their pardon and happiness was so far procur'd; and because those conditions, at least as requir'd by Christ, are not in the power of those for whom he so far satisfi'd and atton'd; by which means, without a farther benefit, they must have been in as ill a posture as if no satisfaction had been made: Therefore it will concern us to enquire farther, whether he did not also procure by his death the collating of such endowments by which we may be able to perform them. For as when we are so clearly assur'd from Scripture, that his own personal honours were conferr'd upon him by occasion of his death, we have no reason to expect any advantages to our selves which were not promerited by it; so without the procuring of this we cannot look upon him as a Saviour, and much less reasonably expect to find him actually such: He being as much in his Sins who hath not Faith enough to sue out his pardon, as he for whom no pardon was ever procur'd. Now there are two sorts of proofs of Christ's having procur'd for us that Grace, which may enable us to attain the pardon purchased by him; whereof the former tend more directly to establish it, the latter indirectly and by consequence. It is sufficiently known from the Scripture, that as we have no ability in our selves to perform what is requir'd on our part toward the attaining of pardon and eternal life, so what ability we have for that purpose we must receive from the *spirit of God* to whom all such gifts are more immediately entitled. But so is it also known, that, though the Spirit of God be the immediate Author of all such gifts, yet our Saviour hath the *dispensation of that spirit*, and the regulating of all those operations whereby he enables the Sons of Men to perform what is required of



them. For how otherwise could it be said, as it is by St. Paul in one place <sup>† Eph. 1. 3, 4, 5.</sup> that God hath *blest us with all spiritual blessings in Christ*, that he hath *chosen us in him*, and *predestinated us to the adoption of children by him*? How otherwise, which is yet more home, that to *every one of us* <sup>† — 7.</sup> is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ? In fine, how otherwise, that from Christ who is our head <sup>† — 4, 15, 16.</sup> the whole body fitly joyned together, and compacted by that which every joynt supplieth, according to the effectual working of him (for so no doubt it ought to be suppli'd) in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of it self in love? These and such like texts being a sufficient argument of Christs dispensing to us all those gracious influences by which we are enabled to *work the works of God*. All therefore that will be requisite for us to enquire, is how so great a power, which to be sure was not naturally inherent in him, came to be conferr'd upon him, and particularly, whether it were upon consideration of that death to which it is attributed by us. Which that it was, will appear from all those texts of Scripture, which attribute our sanctification to his death. For is it not affirm'd by St. Paul <sup>† Tit. 2. 14.</sup> that Christ gave himself for us to redeem us from all iniquity, and purifie to himself a peculiar people zealous of good works? Or, if that may not be thought be to a sufficient proof, because there is no expresse mention of his death (though his giving himself for us and redemption of us do sufficiently imply it) is it not such which we learn from St. Peter <sup>† 1 Pet. 1. 18, 19.</sup> that we were not redeem'd from our vain conversation by silver and gold, but by the much more precious blood of Christ? For beside that that deliverance is immediately effected by the spirit of God, and therefore not at all by Christ but as he is the dispenser of it; making, as St. Peter doth, the blood of Christ to be the price, whereby both his great power and our cleansing is procur'd, he plainly shews that as he obtain'd pardon for us by the shedding of his blood, so he obtain'd also the conferring of these spiritual gifts and graces, which, by that cleansing quality that is in them, make us meet to be partakers of it. By which means, the death of Christ will be found to be as meritorious as it is satisfactory, to procure for us an ability to obtain our pardon, as well as the pardon it self. Of equal force, though not alike clear and direct, is that evidence we have of it from St. Paul where he affirms <sup>† Phil. 2. 8, 9, 10.</sup> the name of Jesus to have been exalted above every name in consideration of his foregoing humiliation, and particularly of his humbling himself to the death of the cross. For neither was it the least part of his exaltation that he was enabled to confer grace upon his Church, and so at the same time both purifie that body of his, and perfectly deliver it from its guilt; nor could that Church of his have been dispos'd without it to give that great honour to his name, which was assur'd to him in consideration of his sufferings. And though I will not be positive in a text which I do not find so appli'd by any, for which cause I have also plac'd it after much more convictive ones; yet it seems to me that when St. Paul <sup>† Eph. 4. 8, 9.</sup>, after he had taken notice of Christ's ascending on high according to the Psalmist, and both leading captivity captive and giving gifts to men, subjoyn'd, *Now that he ascended, what is it but that he descended first into the lower parts of the earth*, he meant thereby both that his giving gifts to men was a great part of his exaltation, and conferr'd upon him in consideration of his low descent before: Whether thereby be meant his descending to the earth by

by his incarnation (which is a phrase our Saviour makes use of to express it) or whether thereby he meant his descending either into the grave or hell which were also parts of his humiliation, and consequent upon that great humiliation of his death. Sure I am, when the same Apostle doth afterwards add, that he *ascended up on high that he might fill all things*, and subjoins, as a proof of that, his *giving those great gifts of Apostles and Prophets* to the Church, he intimates the collating of those gifts to be the end of his ascending on high, and, because the end is greater than that which is only a means to it, to have been a greater exaltation than that.

6. I will conclude this discourse concerning the ends of our Saviour's death, together with the Argument it self, when I have observed from the *Author to the Hebrews* that *in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren*, but especially in his sufferings; that so his own experience of them might prompt him the more to compassionate them in others. For though that Divine Nature wherewith he was replenished could not but give him a sufficient insight into the sufferings of those who had espous'd his cause; yet would there otherwise have wanted in him that sensible emotion which the suffering of like evils doth occasion, and so at least an argument to us (who are wont to think none so apprehensive of evils, as they who have felt them themselves) of his readiness to compassionate and relieve us.

## And Buried.

### The Contents.

After an account of the momentousness of the present Article, which is evidenced both from St. Paul and the place it hath always had in the Creed, an address is made toward the Explication of it. In order whereunto, a short History is premis'd of what hapned from our Saviour's death to his being laid in the grave, and particularly of Gods preserving his bones from being broken: Where again enquiry is made, where that circumstance was foretold, and the Psalm where it is so, shewn at large to belong to the Messiah. A like evidence out of the Prophet Isaiah of the burial of our Saviour; where again is shewn, what was meant by his making his grave both with the wicked and the rich, and how it was fulfilled in our Saviour. Of the ends of this his Burial, both in respect of himself and us.

**N**EXT to our Saviours Death follows his Burial; a thing in all Antient appearance too slight to be inserted in the Creed; and yet even ried. this hath found a place in it, as it did in the more Antient ones. What the design of inserting it was, I shall shew anon, when I have a more proper place for it. It may suffice here to observe that the Creed was not alone in admonishing us to cast aye toward our Saviours grave. *Some for the place where the Lord lay, said the Angel*

Ruffin. Eposit.  
in Symb. Apost.  
Crucifixus sub  
Pontio Pilato  
& Sepultus.  
Vid. etiam Uf-  
serii Tract. de  
Symbolis.

<sup>b</sup> Mat. 28. 6.

<sup>c</sup> 1 Cor. 15.

1, 2, &c. More-  
over brethren I  
declare unto you  
the gospel which  
I preach'd unto  
you, which also  
you have receiv'd, and  
wherein ye  
stand. By which  
also ye are saved  
if ye keep in  
memory what I  
preach'd unto  
you unless ye have  
believed in vain. And then it follows (which shows what Gospel it is he there speaks of) for I delivered  
unto you first of all, that which I also receiv'd; how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he  
was buried, &c.

of God<sup>b</sup> to the women, even after our Saviour was risen from it; and certainly that place must be worthy of our observation when it inclos'd the body of our Saviour; if it were so after he was risen from it. But that which of all others doth most justify the Creed, in inserting our Saviours burial among other the Articles of our faith; is what St. Paul discours'd to the *Corinthians*<sup>c</sup> concerning it. For as he hath there plac'd it between Christ's death and resurrection, as both the nature of the thing requir'd, and the Apostles Creed hath set it; so he doth also recount it as a part of that Gospel, which he had both receiv'd and preach'd, and by which the *Corinthians* were to be saved. If therefore it can no way move you that *that* Universal Church whereof you are a member hath inserted our Saviour's burial into its Creed; if neither your own curiosity, nor gratitude, nor affection, can prevail with you to accompany him thither, yet remember that St. Paul delivers it as Gospel that the Holy Jesus was buried as well as that he died for our sins.

<sup>d</sup> Joh. 19. 31.

<sup>e</sup> — 33.

<sup>f</sup> — 36.

<sup>g</sup> Exo. 12. 46.

<sup>h</sup> 1 Cor. 5. 7.

When our Saviour had now finish'd his sufferings upon the Cross, and his life together with them, the Jews, that his and the others bodies might not remain upon the Cross upon that more solemn sabbath day<sup>d</sup> that followed, besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away. But behold here a signal Providence to the defeating of their farther purposes against the Crucified body of our Lord; as by the more early departure of whose Soul, his bones were kept from being broken<sup>e</sup>, and thereby both they, and the Prophecy that went before concerning it, preserv'd entire. It being particularly remarked by St. John<sup>f</sup>, that these things were done that the Scripture might be fulfilled, *A bone of him shall not be broken*. Only because there is some doubt what that Scripture was which St. John refer'd to, neither hath there been, for ought I know, that light given to it which it doth deserve, I think it but just to spend some time in the investigation of it, and shewing the propriety thereof to that to which it is appli'd. There are who have thought the Scripture refer'd to by St. John to have been that command of God to the Israelites in the ordering of the *Paschal lamb*, that they should not break a bone thereof<sup>g</sup>. And thus much must be granted to them, upon the account of the *Analogy* there was between that Sacrifice and the Sacrifice of our Saviour, whether in respect of the deliverance procur'd by each, or the blood by which it was done, that it may very well be look'd upon as a noble type of *Christ our Passover*, as St. Paul<sup>h</sup> expressly stiles him, and as a prefiguration of what should happen, or rather not happen to his Crucified body. But as this is in strict speech rather the fulfilling of a type than of the Scripture, and we therefore to look out for a more direct one; so methinks St. John himself leads us to it, when he not only delivers it as the importance of a Prophecy rather than of a command, that a bone of him should not be broken, but subjoins immediately after, *And again another Scripture saith, They shall look upon him whom they pierced*. These words and again another Scripture saith importing the former Prophecy to be rather a verbal than a real one, and which was as direct as this. Taking it therefore for granted that we ought at least to look farther than the former command concerning the *Paschal lamb*, I will consider of another saying of the Scrip-  
pture



picture which looks more like it, and which *Grotius* and our own margents refer to; That I mean, which having before spoken of a *righteous* man, affirms that *He* (even God) *keepeth all his bones, not one of them is broken*, or as the Septuagint read it conformably to *St. John*, *ἐν αὐτῷ οὐ συντρίβεται οὐκ ἓν αὐτῶν σπῆλαι σπῆλαι* <sup>1</sup> *Ps. 34. 20.* *not one of them shall be broken.* And here not much to concern my self at the title of this Psalm's attributing the *subject* as well as the *language* of it to *David*, because it is acknowledg'd by the Jews themselves that several passages of the Scripture had both a *first* and *second* sense; not yet at the appearance there may be of its appliableness in a great measure to *righteous* men in the general, because it is manifest from several passages thereof; and particularly from the beginning of it as well as from its title, that some *one* *righteous* man is more particularly intended; I shall make it my business to shew (what undoubtedly will be enough) that there are, if the *New Testament* may be judge, undoubted reasons to apply it unto *Christ*, and no contemptible ones to satisfy ever those who own not its Authority. That there is enough from the *New Testament* so to understand this *Psalm*, will appear if we compare several passages thereof, with what we shall find by that Testament certainly and clearly predicated of *Christ*, or referred to him. For is the term of *righteous* men the thing stuck at in this *Psalm* as if that would extend the contents of it to all that are really such? But beside that we find the *Messiah* still'd the *Lord our righteousness*, even by those Scriptures <sup>2</sup> *Jer. 23. 6.* which the Jews acknowledge; the title of *Just* or *righteous* one, even without any other more distinguishing addition, is by that Testament whereof we speak represented as a sufficient characteristick of him. For *ye denied* (saith *St. Peter*! to those Jews who wonder'd at his healing a Cripple) *the holy one and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you.* <sup>3</sup> *Act. 3. 14.* And *which of the Prophets* (saith *St. Stephen* <sup>4</sup> *Act. 7. 52.* to the like Jews) *have not your fathers persecuted? And they have slain them which shewed before of the coming of the Just one, of which ye have been now the betrayers and murderers.* As; after both, *Ananias* to *St. Paul* now upon his Conversion, *The God of our fathers hath chosen thee that thou shouldst know his will, and see that Just one and shouldst hear the voice of his mouth.* <sup>5</sup> *Act. 22. 14.* Which passages (especially the two former) are so much the more considerable, because spoken to unconverted Jews; and to whom we can hardly imagine that these holy men would have discours'd in that language, if the term of *Just* or *righteous* one had not been, even in their understanding, a proper *Periphrasis* of the *Messiah*. But it is not only that appellation which we have to build upon; though it was that which gave me the first hint toward the due understanding of this *Psalm*. For I found farther, that conformably to what is delivered therein concerning him who is the principal subject of it, *this poor afflicted man sought the Lord*, or, as it is afterwards <sup>6</sup> *Ps. 34. 6.* *cried unto him, and he heard him and delivered him from all his fears*, the Author to the *Hebrews* tells us concerning *Christ* <sup>7</sup> *Heb. 5. 7.* that *in the days of his flesh, or weakness, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, he was heard; and his supplication heard and so delivered from his fear*; The former of these, as it is elsewhere <sup>8</sup> *Ps. 55. 16.* the sense of the word *ἐκράυεν*, because us'd by the *Septuagint* to denote *saying* or *delivering*; so *ἐκράυεν* not only signifying a godly fear, but any fear whatsoever <sup>9</sup> *Act. 23. 10.* and may, where that is also proper, the object of it as well as the passion itself. Though

if

if we should take the word *and* for a godly fear, or fear of God, and so (as our *Translation* doth) make it the cause for which he was heard, rather than the thing from which, it may as well, if not better fit our purpose; because that *poor afflicted man*, whereof the *Psalmist* speaks, immediately after *infers* that *the Angel of the Lord encompasseth about them that fear him*, and by his own example, and the reward he met with for it, prompts them to the like fear and reverence: Which shews, that he was not without that godly fear himself, yea that *that was* the thing for which he was so sav'd and delivered. But of all the things, which contributed to those my apprehensions concerning this higher and better sense of the present Psalm, none seem'd to me to be of greater force, than the application which St. Peter <sup>a</sup> made of the main of the following period. *Come ye children hearken unto me, I will teach you the fear of the Lord. What man is he that desireth life and loveth many days, that he may see good? Keep thy tongue from evil, and thy lips from speaking guile. Depart from evil, and do good; seek peace and pursue it. The eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous, and his ears are open unto their cry. The face of the Lord is against them that do evil.* For whose words were those, as appears by the preamble to them, but of that *righteous* man who is the subject of this *Psalm*, and whom, considering both that preamble and St. Peter's urging and applying them, can we better suppose him to be than Christ? For is it, that there is not appearance enough of this passages relating unto Christ, and his both Doctrine and Rewards? But of that St. Peter will not suffer us to doubt, because not only bringing it in as a proof of that truly Christian precept of *rendring good for evil*, but <sup>a</sup> which is more, as a proof of their being *called* to the practice of it, *that they might inherit a blessing*. For what calling could St. Peter mean writing to Christians, and concerning a truly Christian precept, but their calling to Christianity? And how could that well be prov'd, or indeed at all by such a text of the *Psalmist*, as had not a particular regard to it? The proof being in reason to answer the thing to be proved by it, and if therefore to prove a Christian calling, to have a particular regard to it. And though it will not from thence follow, that the words referr'd to by St. Peter are therefore to be look'd upon as the words of *Christ*, because God might make use of the *Psalmist's* mouth to point men to that doctrine which should afterwards be published by him; Yet as it will make it so much the more easy to believe that the *Psalmist* speaks there in the person of *Christ*, because it is of his doctrine and rewards that he doth there manifestly speak, so even that will not much be question'd after I have shewn what appearance there is from Christ's title of *Just*, and the like *prayers and delivery*, that he is that *righteous* person who is there brought in *teaching his children the fear of the Lord*. Especially, when it is also known from and observed by the *Author to the Hebrews*, out of the Prophet *Isay* <sup>2</sup>, that Christ in the Old Testament giveth his Disciples the title of *children*, and discourseth both to, and of them as such. For this will make it yet more probable, that the words that follow both in that *Psalm* and St. Peter are no other than the words and call of *Christ*; and consequently, that he is that *righteous* person, of whom it is afterwards affirmed, that *not one of his bones should be broken*, which was the thing to be proved by us. Sure I am, when St. Peter, a little before *speaking* of a like duty, affirms those he wrote to, to have been *called there-*

unto,

<sup>a</sup> Psa. 34. 7, 9.  
11.

<sup>a</sup> 1 Pet. 3. 10.  
2c.

<sup>a</sup> ——— 9.

<sup>1</sup> Heb. 2. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Isa. 8. 18.

<sup>a</sup> 1 Pet. 2. 21.

unto, he produceth for a proof of it, the call they had by *Christ's* own immediate practice, and who by that practice of his left them *an example* that they should follow his steps. Such evidences there are from the New Testament of this *Psalm's* belonging to the *Messiah*, and therefore also of that passage relating more particularly to him, wherein it is affirm'd that *not one of his bones should be broken*; but how to evince so much to a Jew by whom that New Testament is not acknowledg'd is not indeed so easie, and, considering the great refractoriness of such persons, almost impossible to be done: But as the question between them and us, is not so much concerning the Prophecies relating to the *Messiah*, but concerning the person to whom they had ought to be appli'd; So whatever it may, it ought to signifie something to them, that this and other such like Prophecies were understood by those Jews, that followed our Saviour, of the *Messiah*, and as such urged and pressed by them: Especially when it appears from their own writings, that many of those Prophecies, which were urged by our Saviour's Disciples as relating to the *Messiah*, were by their own unconverted forefathers alike understood of him, though the latter Jews depart from it. For supposing, as they well may, that our Saviour's Disciples were sober and intelligent men, though in an error as to the application of those Prophecies unto him, and they must also suppose that they would not lightly have urged this or other such like Prophecies as relating to the *Messiah*, if it had not been then agreed upon between the other Jews and them, that they did indeed relate to him.

But to return to that from which I have diverted, and to go on, as I have begun to do, to accompany our Saviour to his grave. For as it was not without a signal providence that his bones, as well as the former Prophecy were preserv'd entire, considering how likely they were to have been broken; So it was not without much less, considering the circumstances he was now in, that those bones of his did not meet with a very dishonourable Sepulture, and such as would have ill agreed with the dignity of his person, as well as with another Prophecy to be in due time produced by us. But as *there is no wisdom nor understanding nor counsel* <sup>b</sup> *against the Lord*, so it appears from the New Testament, that, whatever the Jewes might have design'd concerning the body of our Lord, it met, through the procurement of God, with an honourable interment. For *Joseph of Arimathea* <sup>c</sup> a rich man and a disciple of our Lord, <sup>d</sup> *Joh. 19. 38.* though hitherto only in secret, did upon this occasion lay by his former fears, and become a sutor unto Pilate, that he might take away the body of *Jesus*, which accordingly Pilate granted him. And having thus taken him down, he and *Nicodemus* <sup>d</sup>, a person of no less esteem than <sup>e</sup> *Pro. 21. 30.* the former, and till this time also a secret Disciple, *wind up the body in linnen cloathes with the myrrhe and aloes and spices* which *Nicodemus* had prepar'd, as the manner of the Jews is to bury. This done, they laid it in a new Tomb, which *Joseph* had hewen out of a Rock for himself, and rouled a great Stone to the door of the Sepulcher, and departed.

In my explication of which story, I will proceed in this method,

1. I will shew the agreement thereof with the predictions of the Old Testament.
2. The end of this his Burial.
1. I have oftentimes had occasion, especially since my entrance upon the



the story of our Saviour's sufferings, to refer to the *fifty third* chapter of *Isay*, and I have done so the rather, because as that is one of the most noted Prophecies concerning him, so to evidence yet farther, that it is indeed a Prophecy concerning him: There being not in mine opinion a more convincing argument of that, than the agreement of the several particularities thereof with the story of our Saviour in the New Testament. For though the agreement of that story with some scattered particulars of the Old Testament may seem to have been rather of chance than design, yet not so, when there shall be found to be an accord between the story of our Saviour, and so long a series of circumstances, as there is in that Prophecy of *Isay*: such an accord being an argument of their being brought about by him, by whom they were at first design'd, and foretold. Now in that Prophecy, as before we had an indication of our Saviour's sufferings and death, so also of his burial and the manner of it. For having said before that the person of whom he speaks was *cut off out of the land of the living, for the transgression of my people was he stricken*, it immediately subjoins *And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death: Because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth*: Thereby not only shewing, that he of whom he speaks, was to be *buried*, but that he should be buried also *with the rich*, and such a rich *one* too (for it is in the singular number <sup>†</sup> that the Prophet speaks) as should add no disreputation to him, because of the like innocency with himself. The only thing that hath occasion'd any scruple in this affair, is his being said to *make his grave with the wicked* as well as *with the good and rich*, as which seems to hold no affinity with the story of our Saviours burial, any more than it doth with it self. But as they who do so object (as the Jews are forward enough to do) should do well to reconcile the Prophecy to it self, before they object to us Christians the inconsistency thereof with our Saviour's burial, so if they attempted the doing of that, they would soon find (what will contribute not a little to justify our application of it) that we are of necessity to understand the Prophet as speaking in different senses, when he affirms the person spoken of to *make his grave both with the wicked and the rich and good*: It being impossible, because all contradictions are so, that a man should have at the same time, and in the same sense, his burial with the *wicked* and *good*, and so both an *honourable* and a *dishonourable* one. But from hence it will not be difficult to collect the reasonableness of that answer which Christianity commonly returns to the objections of the Jews against our Saviours burial. For when it is apparent that the *Prophet* could not intend what he spake, in one and the same sense, when he affirm'd that the *Messiah* should make his grave both *with the wicked* and *the rich and good*; when it is in like manner evident from the words that immediately follow, that he should therefore be put *with the rich in his death because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth*; what can be more reasonable than to say, as Christianity doth, that what the Prophet spake as to his making his grave *with the wicked* was with reference to the design of his enemies, and who no doubt as they basely murdered him, so would be likely enough to give him the burial of a malefactor, but that God should otherwise order it; and because it was more through other mens malice, than any ill deserts of his own, that he was put to death, that he should make his grave *not with the wicked* but

\* Isa. 53. 9.

אֶת-עֲשִׂירָה

with the rich and honourable; The *making of his grave* otherwise with the wicked being very well consistent either with his *making his grave with the rich* and honourable, or with his own innocence and worth. Though, if I may indulge to conjecture, as what should hinder me when the truth of the prophecy is so well secur'd, I should think the truth of the *Prophecy* may be yet further secur'd, and our Saviour be said at the same time to be buried *with the wicked and the rich*. For when it is affirmed by St. *John*<sup>s</sup> that *the garden*, wherein our Saviour's Sepulchre was, *was in that very place where he was crucified*; when it is farther evident from the same St. *John*<sup>h</sup> that *the place, where he was crucified*, had the name of *Golgotha* or *the place of a skull*, what should hinder us (especially when men have nothing but conjecture to go by as to the reason of that appellation) to affirm it to have been so stil'd, because it was a place of burial, but especially (for the nearness of it) of such crucified persons, or other malefactors that were allow'd burying at all? The *piece of a skull*, as it is no inconvenient appellation of a burial place where the skulls and bones of dead men are deposited, and which, upon a new digging, do present those skulls and bones anew to the spectators eyes; so being altogether as proper to signify it, as a place where men are beheaded or otherwise put to death, or a place strewd with the skulls and bones of those who so suffered, as others have conjectur'd, but with the less reason, because it is hard to believe, that when they came to fall there, but that the survivors would shew so much *humanity* as to give them an interment. But so therefore if we understand the name of *Golgotha*, as seems to me but reason to do, the forementioned Prophecy of the Prophet *Isay* will come to be yet more punctually and literally fulfill'd in our Saviour's burial. For by this means he may at the same time have his grave *with the wicked*, because in their common place of burial, and yet also *with the rich* and honourable, because though in the common place of sepulture, yet for the evidence of his innocence in a piece of ground which the no less good than rich Arimathean had taken out for a place of pleasure whilst he lived, and for the repose of his body after his departure hence.

II. We have seen the consent between the Prophecy and the history, proceed we now to consider of the ends of our Saviour's burial. Whereof

I. The *first* and *most natural* was no doubt the paying respect to the body of so great a person, and from which, though the Soul was, yet the Divine Nature was never separated: It being the language of the *Creed* concerning him, that the *Son of God* and *our Lord* was *buried* as well as *conceiv'd and born and crucified and dead*, as of the Scripture, or rather of an Angel speaking in it that the Sepulchre was <sup>Mat. 28. p.</sup> a place *where the Lord lay*. For well may we think the paying of respect to our Saviour's body to have been one great end of our Saviour's burial, when the Divine Nature was as yet and ever will be united to it; especially when we moreover find it assur'd to him, that in consideration of his great innocence<sup>k</sup> he should make his grave *with the rich*, and threaten'd to another great Prince, though a wicked one, that he should have *the burial of an Ass, drawn and cast forth beyond the gates of Jerusalem*: such a denunciation as that, and the former promise, shewing the decent interment of the dead, to have been intended as a testimony of respect to them, and how much more then of that of our Saviour. And though I do not find by any express Scripture, that God

<sup>1</sup> Luc. 20. 38.

— 37.

intended by that burial of our Saviour to prompt the world to bestow the same decent interment upon his members ; Though there was one farther for the decent interment of our Saviours body, than can be supposed to be in meer humane ones, because the union between them and their diviner part is then perfectly dissolved ; Yet will it not be difficult to collect that to have been its intendment, if we consider what relation all holy persons bear to him, yea what relation those very bodies bear to him, that have been forced to part with their ancient guests. For since even these are not without the hopes, yea without an assurance of a resurrection, since, though they are *dead* to the world yet they are *alive unto God*<sup>1</sup>, yea so far (as our Saviour spake concerning *Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*<sup>m</sup>) that God doth not disdain to be called *their God* ; they must in that respect be look'd upon as still retaining their relation unto Christ whose members they are, and for that reason therefore be allow'd the same decent and honourable interment : He, who calls for this or that testimony of respect unto his Son, not obscurely intimating it to have been his intention, provided it do not exceed the proportion due unto them, that the like should be paid unto those who are the members of his body, as without which he shall be dishonoured in them. Neither let any man concern himself at the seeming unfutableness of such a relation to him, in that which is either rotteness or dust and ashes. For beside that even God doth not disdain to be called *their God*, to whom he was so when they were alive ; besides that the relation between the *dead* body of our Redeemer, and the living God, may seem alike, if not more unfutable, because arising from and founded in the personal union thereof to him ; That body wherein the Holy Ghost hath sometime inhabited, and from which it was never divorced by the sin of him to whom it did belong, may well be thought to have contracted so much honour from it, as to make it triumph above all those inglorious circumstances, which the power of death draws after it. Otherwise the same *Spirit*, which inhabited in it when it was alive, would not again *quicken it*<sup>2</sup>, and restore it to its pristine life, yea a much more glorious one.

<sup>2</sup> Rom. 8. 11.

2. From that first end of our Saviours burial pass we to a second ; for we cannot well think any thing relating unto him not to have been without several and great designs. Now that I should think, and I suppose not without reason, to have been the giving a yet farther testimony to the truth of his preceeding death, as which could never be too much confirm'd, considering how much the truth of his future resurrection depended on it. For as it was the observation of *Origen*<sup>o</sup> (that I say not also of *Celsus* himself) concerning such persons in the heathen stories, as are said to have risen from the dead, that it did not appear that they were ever really dead, but only for a time withdrew themselves from the sight of men, the better to beget an opinion of their resurrection afterwards ; So if the death of Christ had not been accompanied with all the forementioned circumstances, and particularly with this of his solemn interment, it might have given occasion to the world to have denied that he was ever truly dead, and together with that his future resurrection. But when, as the same *Origen* observes<sup>p</sup>, and we have also<sup>q</sup> out of him, his death was so publick and notorious, that, all things considered, it could not well have been more ; when that death of his was followed by so solemn an interment, and of which, considering the vicinity

<sup>o</sup> Orig. li. 2. ad  
versus Celsum  
p. 95 item. li. 3.  
p. 125.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. li. 2.

p. 25.

<sup>q</sup> Explication of  
the word Dead.

nity



nity of it to the place, as well as time of his crucifixion, we cannot well think there could want sufficient witnesses; all occasion of suspicion was taken away, to the truth of his past death, and, so far as that could prove it, of his resurrection also.

3. I will take my leave of this Article, after I have first admonished, that, as whatsoever was done either by or to our Saviour was intended to reflect some advantage upon us, and particularly to be an *example* to us that *we should follow his steps*; so it is apparent from St. Paul<sup>1</sup>, that our Saviour's burial was intended to prompt us to be *buried* in like manner unto sin, yea to be *buried with him in Baptism* to it: That so we might not think of any other resurrection from it, than what the rising unto *newness of life* should give us, yea that that very Sacrament of Baptism should serve as a standing monument of it. Of which the *Ancient Church* was so sensible, that to that primitive and truly Christian institution of *immersion*, they added the dipping of the party *three several times*<sup>1</sup> to represent the three dayes our Saviour continu'd in the grave (for that we find<sup>2</sup> to have been the intention of some) and made the *Eve of Easter* one of the solemn times<sup>3</sup> of the administration of it. If the Church have any where departed from that truly Christian rite, it is to be imputed, at least as to our own<sup>4</sup>, to the coldness of the *Climate*, and it may be to the delicacy of those that inhabit in it, rather than to a belief of its not being primarily design'd by the Author of *Baptism*, or not intended as a Symbol both of Christ's burial and resurrection, and our own. And if the Sacrament were reduc'd to its Ancient Standard, and Baptism (as it anciently was<sup>5</sup>) administred only on the feasts of *Easter* and *Whitsuntide*, save where necessity did otherwise require, the most tender infant might for ought I know be *buried with Christ in Baptism*, and yet come out again a living member of his body. But be that as it will (for I list not to contend about any thing, which is not an essential of Baptism, as I could never yet believe that rite of *immersion* to be) This is most certain, that as it was both the Ancient rite, and intended for a Symbol both of Christ's burial as well as resurrection and our own, so it ought not to be forgotten by those, who make that *burial*, and the *ends* of it, the subject of their discourse, as they who have the *Creed* for their's are certainly oblig'd to do.

<sup>1</sup> Rom. 6. 4.  
Col. 2. 12.

<sup>1</sup> Tert. de Cor.  
cap. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Cave Primit.  
Christ. part 1.  
c. 10.

<sup>3</sup> Cave Ibid.  
<sup>4</sup> See the office  
of Publick Bapti.

<sup>5</sup> Tert. de Bapti.  
sm. c. 19.

# He descended into Hell.

## The Contents.

*Of the truth of Christ's descent into Hell, and what evidence there is of it in the Scripture. An enquiry into the sense of it in the Creed and in the Scripture, where is shewn that that descent was made by Christ's Soul, that it was by a local and not vertial motion; but whether by a strict and proper descent, or only so stil'd from the opinion of the generality of men, or other like reasons, is doubted. Of the word hell and the literal notation of it, which is shewn to be no other than that of an unseen place; as also, that it signifies, and particularly in the Scripture, not a state but a place, as that again, to be, unless abusively taken, a place not of dead bodies but departed Souls, yea of good and bad. That hell into which Christ is affirmed to have pass'd, shewn to be that part of it in which holy Souls are lodg'd, and the consistency thereof with the hopes of Christ in being delivered from thence shewn. The ends of this descent into hell considered both as to the more general and particular notion of Hell.*

He descended into Hell.

**T**HOUGH I had once some thoughts of passing over Christ's descent into hell with some short probation of it out of the Scriptures, as considering how difficult it must needs be to determine any thing of that place whose very name is *invisible*; Yet considering again with my self, not only that that *Article* hath now for many hundred years found a place in that *Creed* which the whole Church of God hath receiv'd, but that the chief reason, why some among us have bogled at the *Creed*, is because of that one passage in it, I resolv'd to allot that also a just discourse, and so follow our Saviour as well to this *Hades*, as to the Grave.

Now there are three things within which I intend to bound my discourse concerning Christ's descent into hell,

1. The *truth* of it.
2. The *meaning* of it, and
3. The *ends* of it.

I. And here setting aside what other texts are alledg'd for this *Article*, as either capable of some other sense, or not strongly enough evincing this, I shall content my self with that only evidence which St. Peter <sup>a</sup> will afford us, where he endeavours to evince out of the *Psalmist* <sup>b</sup> the *Messiah's* resurrection from the dead. *I foresaw the Lord always before my face, for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved. Therefore did my heart rejoyce, and my tongue was glad, moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope. Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption. For of whom was it, as St. Peter <sup>c</sup> argues, that these words were spoken? Nay in whom could the Jews suppose them to have been verified if not in Christ?*  
Should

<sup>a</sup> Act. 2. 25,

8cc.

<sup>b</sup> Psal. 16. 8.

<sup>c</sup> Act. 2. 29.

Should they say in *David*, as to him in all probability they ought to be ascrib'd, because known to have been penned by himself? But they should then have to witness against them that *Sepulchre* wherein he was interr'd, and wherein, for ought that did appear, his ashes were still preserved. And though it would not from thence follow, that therefore they must be meant of *Christ*, because it might have been said that they belong'd to one who was different from both; yet since it was not unknown to them, that *Christ* was often foretold both in the book of *Psalms* and in the other Scriptures, since it was in like manner known to them that *that Messiah* was sometime foretold under the name and title of *David*, and who therefore must most probably be meant by those Prophecies of *David*, which, though spoken as of his own person, yet could not be verified of him; since lastly, so glorious a prophecy could not well be thought to have been intended of any other than him, in whom, by their own confession, all glorious things were to center; it was not without reason that St. Peter<sup>d</sup> inferr'd that *David*<sup>d</sup> spake of Christ and his resurrection, when he affirm'd that *his soul should not be left in hell, neither should his flesh see corruption*. But it may be, those words, of whomsoever meant, or to whomsoever applied, do not prove a *descent into hell*, or at least not *such a descent* as the *Creed* affirms. That indeed will require some farther elucidation, but which we shall not need to go much beyond these words for. For is it that there is no mention there of any *going to hell*, that we should think even, so much could not be legitimately inferred from them? But as the word we render *hell* is no other in the present *Greek Creed*, than what it is in the *Septuagint* version of that Psalm, and in St. Peter's quotation of it; So the *Psalmist* affirming by way of Prediction that God *should not leave the Messiahs soul in hell*, as St. Peter by way of history that *his soul was not left there*, supposeth him to have passed into it: There being no fear of *his being left in hell*, and therefore no great grace in God's promising *not to leave him* there, who was without any apprehension of coming into it. Is it then that though there be an accord thus far between those Scriptures and the *Creed*, yet there is not as to Christ's passing into hell upon, and after his death, as the very placing of this *Article* in the *Creed* obligeth us to understand it? But neither of this can any doubt be made by those, who consider St. Peter's inferring the Resurrection of our Saviour from it: Resurrection, as it supposeth a preceding death, and a rising from it, so being not therefore to be proved by any other delivery from *hell*, than which he stood in need of, by falling into it after the undergoing of the other. Is it lastly, that, though those Scriptures and the *Creed* agree as to our Saviours passing into hell upon and after his death, yet they do not as to his *descending* or *going down* thither? Yet will not that term of *descent* be thought to be unreasonably added, if we consider what the Scripture hath elsewhere said either of *hell* or *good mens* passing thither. For being the Scripture doth not only represent *hell* as a place *beneath*, but affirm even *good men* to have *descended* thither<sup>e</sup> at their deaths, neither can it be thought unreasonable for the *Creed* to represent him as so passing thither, who passed from the same earth unto it.

2. But because among wise and sober men there is no other controversy about Christ's *descent into hell*, than as to the interpretation of it, therefore proceed we to enquire what is the intendment of it in the *Creed*,

<sup>d</sup> Act. 2. 30, 31

<sup>e</sup> Job 11. 8.

Psa. 86. 13.

Psa. 139. 8.

Mat. 11. 23.

<sup>f</sup> Gen. 37. 35.

42. 38.



\* Pearson on the  
Creed, pag. 479,  
480. ed. 4.

† Act. 2. 31.

‡ Num. 6. 6.  
Lev. 21. 11.  
— 22. 4.

*Creed*, and what evidence there is of that intendment in the Scriptures. In order whereunto I shall not doubt to represent it as a part of it, that this *descent* whatsoever it was, and whithersoever it was made, was made by the *Soul* of the Messiah. For neither can we well think otherwise, when the disposal of our Saviour's body was before spoken of; and much less, when the Church, how much soever divided about other particulars, is clear & for the descending of our Saviour's *Soul* into that place, into which he is here affirmed to pass. For if this latter were a thing known and confess'd, there is so much the more reason to believe it to have been intended *here*, but especially, after it came to be inserted in the *Creed*, together with the disposal of that other part of him his body: It being not to be thought, that men of sense and understanding would, in so short a *Summary* as this, have made use of a new and more obscure Phrase to denote that disposal of the body of our Saviour, which was before not only sufficiently, but much more clearly express'd. Not much more reasonable in my opinion is the refuge of those men, who, because they could not well interpret this *descent*, of Christ's *descent into the grave*, would have us to understand thereby his *entering into the state of the dead*, or rather his *continuance* in it. For as the word we render *hell* signifies not a *state* but a place, as I shall shew when I come to the explication of it, so Christ's continuance in the state of the dead is sufficiently intimated in that *third day* wherein he is affirmed to have risen from it. So hard a matter will it be found to elude that interpretation of the *Creed*, which makes the *descent* there spoken of to be the descent of our Saviour's *Soul*; And that the *Creed* hath so far the attestation of Scripture, will need no other evidence than that forequoted passage of the Psalmist, and St. Peter's Exposition of it. For when to the Psalmist's affirming that *God would not leave his Soul in hell, neither suffer his holy one to see corruption*, St. Peter adds by way of Explication, that *his Soul was not left in hell, neither did his flesh see corruption*; thereby manifestly opposing the *Soul* there spoken of to the *flesh* or body: What pretence can remain for the understanding of that *Soul* in any other sense than its most natural and proper one? By which means what hath been sometime objected concerning the word *Soul*'s being sometime taken for a body, yea a dead one, will be found to be both unreasonable and impertinent. For the question is not whether the word *Soul* may be sometime taken for a body, yea a dead one, which I for my own part do not in the least doubt of, but whether it may be so taken, where it is contradicting distinguish'd from, and opposed unto *flesh*, as it is in the place before remembred.

It appearing from the premises what *that* was which did descend, or rather by *what part* of him it was, that our Saviour did so; enquire we in the next place whether the descent here spoken of be *local* or *vertnal*, as again if *local*, whether it were a *true* and *proper* descent, or only so stil'd in regard of the opinion of the generality of men, or from other such collateral considerations. As to the first of these much need not be said, were it not that men are more willing to bring both *Creed* and Scripture to their own fancies, than to receive their information from them. For who can think a *vertnal* and *Metaphorical* descent intended in that *Creed*, whose design is simply and nakedly to represent what was done by or hapned unto our Saviour? Nay who can pretend so to opine, without bringing into question what is affirmed concerning his death and resurrection? For if we are to understand by Christ's *descent into hell* a

*vertnal*

*vernal* and *metaphorical* one, why not also a *vernal* or *metaphorical* death and resurrection? the descent of Christ into Hell being delivered in the same tenour, and with the same historical simplicity, wherewith those other Articles are. Sure I am it will be much more hard to impose such a sense upon that passage of the *Psalmist*, from which St. Peter endeavours to prove Christs resurrection from the dead. For beside that it doth not appear what kindness there could be either to our Saviour or mankind, in not leaving Christs Soul in hell, if the only descent that it made were a *vernal* one, as that again exercised upon those evil spirits that reigned there; St. Peter endeavouring to prove from that passage the resurrection of Christ from the dead, must consequently be supposed to shew that it was both the promise and design of God, to bring back from that hell, into which it had descended, that Soul which was to reanimate his now entombed body, and consequently, that it passed thither not by a *vernal* but *local* motion. I will not be so positive in affirming this passage of our Saviours Soul into Hell to be by a *true* and *proper* descent; Partly, because the *Psalmist*, and after him St. Peter, who speak most clearly concerning it, say nothing to found such a true and proper descent upon, and partly because I am not without hopes to shew that that *Hades* into which the Soul of our Saviour pass'd, was that part of it wherein Holy Souls were lodged: Which though there may be some presumption from Scripture<sup>k</sup> and Antiquity<sup>l</sup> to affirm to be a place *beneath the earth*, and so their motion thither properly enough termed a *descent*, yet is there as great presumption for the placing it *above* the earth, both from the opinions of the Heathen, and from the Scripture. For thus, as the Late Reverend Primate Usher hath shewn<sup>m</sup>, even they, who among the Heathen believ'd one *Hades* to contain all departed Souls, did yet not infrequently affirm that part of it, which contain'd holy ones, to be *above*; yea in *bea-ven*: And though our Saviour sufficiently intimates the Soul of the *rich man* in *Hades* to be in an inferiour place, yet he as clearly intimates the place of *Lazarus* and the *bosom of Abraham* to be far removed<sup>n</sup> from the other, and, as appears too by the rich man's lifting up his eyes to behold them, in a *superiour* one. Not to say, that there may be as much or more presumption, from other places of Scripture<sup>o</sup>, of such a situation of the receptacle of pious and holy Souls. Against which if it should be replied, that this may seem to make against the *Creed*, as with whole term of *descent* such a situation may seem not to be consistent, I should think it enough to answer, not only that the Scriptures do somewhere speak after the same manner, when they entreat of the passage of holy Souls thither, but that that expression might be founded, partly, in the general opinion of the world, and in accordance with which the Scripture itself oftentimes doth not disdain to speak, and partly, in the imperfection of the state of holy Souls (wheresoever their habitation is) till they come to be reunited unto their bodies: That motion being not improperly termed a *descent*, which is made unto a place, where there is a mixture of humiliation as well as happiness.

Now though from what hath been said it do in some measure appear, what it is we are to understand by that *Hades* or *Hell*, into which our Saviour is said either to have descended or pass'd (for if the Soul of Christ be that which did descend, that *Hades* or *Hell* to which he is said to have descended, must be concluded to be the place of departed Souls) yet to clear that notion a little farther, and together therewith to shew to what

apartment

<sup>k</sup> See the texts before quoted to shew the propriety of the term of descent.  
<sup>l</sup> Pearson ubi supra.

<sup>m</sup> Answer to a Challenge made by a Jesuit, p. 363. &c.

<sup>n</sup> Luc. 16. 26. 23.

<sup>o</sup> Luc. 23. 43. compared with 2 Cor. 12. 2. 4.



apartment in *Hades* he went, I will enter into a more particular discourse concerning it, beginning first of all with the literal signification or *ἔτυμον* thereof. Now the word which we render *hell* or *Hades* is as much as *ἡ ἰδὴ, τίς*, the place which is unseen, or remov'd from the sight of men.

<sup>p</sup> Ham. Annot.  
in Mat. 11. 1.

<sup>r</sup> *Ἄϊδ'· κυ-  
ρίν, ἀδύατον  
τινὶς· ὃ πα-  
ρὲβόλονται ὁ  
θεοί, ὅταν δι-  
λυσθῇ ἀλλή-  
λοις μὴ γινώ-  
σκεισθαι, &c.*

<sup>v</sup> *Verfugan.  
English An-  
tiqu. cap. 7.*

<sup>t</sup> *Answ. to the  
Jesuit's Chall.  
p. 314.*

And hence *ἐν ᾧ οὐκ ἔστιν* is sometime interpreted <sup>p</sup> *ἐν ἀδύατῳ κρύβεται* to be in an uncertain place, and *Ἄϊδ'· κυρίν* or the *Helmet of Hell* is by *Hesychius* <sup>q</sup> rendered a cloud wherewith the Gods covered themselves when they would not be known by one another: A name this very proper to describe the place of those that are departed out of this world, and particularly the place which their Souls possess; partly, because of the uncertainty of the places wherein they are bestowed; but more especially in regard of our own great uncertainty, as to the particular place, or state of this or that mans soul, after its departure hence. And though the word *Hell* carry nothing of that signification in our present speech, yet in the Old Saxon tongue from which it is deriv'd *Helled* <sup>r</sup> is as much as *covered* or *hidden*, and in *Ireland* (for so I suppose I must understand him, though there are the remains of the like language in some Counties in *England*) with them that retain the Ancient language which their Forefathers brought with them out of *England*, to *hell the head*, as the forementioned *Primate* <sup>t</sup> instructs us, is as much as *to cover the head*, and he that covereth the house with tile or slate is from thence commonly called a *bellier*. So that in the *Original* propriety both of the Greek and English, the word *Hades* or *Hell* signifies no more than the place which is *unseen*, or remov'd from the sight of men.

<sup>u</sup> *Pag. 473. &c.  
edit. 4.*

<sup>v</sup> *Gen. 42. 38.*

<sup>w</sup> *Luc. 16. 24.*

From the literal notation of the word *Hades* or *Hell*, pass we to the thing signified by it, but wherein we must not expect to proceed with so little disturbance. For some eagerly contend for the understanding it of the *State of the dead*, whilst others, though they will allow it to signify a place, yet, so far at least as the Scripture is concern'd, and, by the measure of that, the Creed also, a place rather of *dead bodies* than of *departed souls*. As concerning the first of these opinions I shall refer my self to the learned labours of Dr. *Pearson* upon this Article <sup>u</sup>, who among other things hath alledg'd the opinion of the Ancient Greeks, who held there were many persons who were believ'd by them to be dead, yea to continue in the state of the dead, whom yet they believ'd not to be in *Hades*, as those who died before their time, and those whose bodies were unburied. That which I shall choose rather to combate, is the opinion of those who make *hell*, at least in the *Scripture*, the place of dead bodies rather than of departed Souls. For suppose we first some texts of Scripture, wherein the Hebrew *Sheol* and the Greek *Hades* are made use of, to intimate something of *corporeity* in those persons, that are said to descend into, or be deposited in them; As for example, when it is alledg'd by *Jacob* <sup>v</sup> that his sons would *bring down his gray hairs with sorrow to the grave or hell* (For that use, if I mistake not, I have sometime seen made of his *gray hairs* to infer its noting rather the grave than hell.) Yet, as the meaning of those words may be no other, than that they would cause him, who was now old and gray headed, to die with sorrow, and so pass in his soul into the place of departed ones; So if such niceties as those may be stood upon, I would fain know what they will say to the *parable* of the rich man in *Hades*, and of the both complaint he makes there of the scorching of his tongue <sup>w</sup>, and his desire that *Lazarus* might be sent to dip his finger in water and cool it? There being



being not any, for ought I know, who understand either that *Hades*, or the *bosom of Abraham*, of any other than of the receptacles of evil and good souls, but to be sure no pretension for it; that whole *Parable* proceeding upon the supposition of the one and other's continuing in the state of the dead, as appears both from what is affirm'd concerning each of their *deaths*, and the rich mans *burial*; as also from the desire of the rich man that one might be *sent unto his brethren, from the dead*<sup>2</sup>, lest they also should come into that place of torment. Which hath made me think, as I suppose wiser men before me, that the Scripture in condescension to the infirmities of men (who know not well to apprehend of Souls without something of corporeity adjoyned to them) spake after that manner there concerning *Hades* and *Abraham's bosom*; and why not then so in other places where they are made use of? But be it secondly (for it is not my purpose to cope with those, whose reading I cannot pretend to, and much less as to all those places of Scripture which are alledg'd for that their notion) be it, I say; that the Hebrew *Sheol*, and conformably the Greek *Hades*; doth sometimes signifie a grave, whether *natural* or *artificial*, I will not contend neither; yet would it not be enquir'd whether the most natural and usual signification thereof be not the place of departed Souls, and if it be, whether that sence ought not in reason to be adher'd to, where there is not some circumstance in the text to oblige men to depart from it? Now that the most natural and usual signification of the word *Sheol* is the *place of departed souls*, seems to me evident, first; from the *Septuagint's* generally translating it *Hades*, which I think will hardly be deni'd to signifie most usually the place of departed Souls; As will appear from the *Greeks* setting up judges in it, as those judges allotting the persons brought into it their several stations, whether of misery, or happiness, agreeably to their respective demerits. For these are things that do no way suit the *grave*, and therefore to be understood of the other. And indeed so usual and proper is this signification of the word *Hades* among them, that the Reverend *Primate* so often mentioned though he took pains to shew that the word *Hades* is sometime us'd in another sence, yet he passeth by the proof of this<sup>3</sup> as a thing that no body could doubt of (so many and well known were the testimonies for it) and which therefore, if I had no other reason to think so, would perswade me to believe, that it is in it self the most usual one. If therefore the *Septuagint*, who certainly understood their own language as well as the latter *Rabbins*, made use of the word *Hades* for the most part to translate the Hebrew *Sheol*; it may pass for no contemptible proof of the same being the most usual signification of it, because the most usual signification of *Hades* among the *Greeks*. Which hath made me sometime admire; why when the *Septuagint* in two places of *Genesis*<sup>b</sup>, render the word *Sheol* by *Hades* or the place of departed souls, the Authority of some *Paraphrasts* should be thought to incline us rather to understand it of the *Grave*; though there be no necessity at all so to interpret it. For what should hinder us to understand both those passages of *Jacob*, of his mourning unto death, and so passing, as he knew he must; to that other world, to which after death all souls do betake themselves? I alledge secondly; what seems to me to be of no small force as to this affair; the opinion of the *Ancienter Jews* (and by whom, it may be; we may better regulate our judgments than by the *modern*) concerning that *Sheol* or *Hades*, after the due interpretation

— 22.

— 30.

<sup>a</sup> Answer to the  
Jesuits Chall.  
pag. 364, &c.

<sup>b</sup> Gen. 37. 35.  
— 42. 38.

tation whereof we are now enquiring. For what other notion had *Josephus* of *Hades*, and by consequence of *Sheol* when he affirms \* the

\* De bello Jud. li. 2. p. 788. ed. Amel. Allobr.

Ψυχὴς τὰς ἡδοναῖς, καὶ τὰς τιμωρίας, καὶ τὰς ἀντιποινήσεις.

Idem, Judaic. Antiqu. li. 18. c. 2. Ἀδράργον τὸ ἰσθὺν τὰς ψυχῶν, οἷός τις αὐτοῖς εἶναι καὶ ὑπὸ χθονὸς δικαιοσύνης τὰ καὶ τιμῶν οἷς ἀρετῆς ἢ κακίας ἐκτελέουσιν ἐν τῷ βίῳ γέγονε.

\* Adv. Celsum, li. 5. p. 260. Ed. Cant. συνέλεγον δὲ τὸ, καὶ δὲν αἰμα γένεσι καὶ συμπαροῦσι τοῦ λόγου διδόντες αὐτοῖς ἡ ψυχῆς ἀθανάσιαν, καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ γῆν δικαιοσύνης, καὶ τὰς τιμῶν τῶν καλῶς βεβαιούτων.

*Sadducees* to take away all punishments and honours in *Hades*? As elsewhere that the *Pharisees*, a much more orthodox sect, believ'd <sup>d</sup> the souls of men to be immortal, and that they did under the earth receive judgments and honours sutable to their past virtuous or wicked life; which, though no express mention of *Hades*, yet is a sufficient description of it. Though that this was not his only opinion, but the general opinion of the *Ancienter Jews*, we have *Origen* \* also to bear witness who tells us concerning the Jews, that they were from their infancy imb'd with the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and of the tribunals under the earth, and the rewards that are there dispens'd to those that have liv'd well; which what it means, I suppose no man is so dull as to need to be told.

Such was the notion the more Ancient and less prejudiced Jews had of *Hades* and *Sheol*, the words we are now enquiring into the due importance of. And whether their Interpretation be not to be prefer'd before that of the Modern ones, I shall leave those to judge, who shall consider, I do not say only the greater opportunity they had to understand their own language, and the language of the Scripture, but how careful (as Doctor *Pocock* hath observ'd, and I have before \* remarked out of him) the latter Jews have been to recede even from the interpretations of their own Ancients, where they seem'd in any measure to favour the pretensions of the Christians. For why may we not imagin this spirit of opposition to have predominated in their interpretations of the word *Sheol*? Especially when we find *Aben-Ezra* <sup>f</sup>, in his *Comment* upon those words of *Jacob*, *I will go into Sheol unto my son mourning*, take so much care to instruct his Disciples, that the *Translator* of the erring persons (meaning the *Vulgar Latin* used by the Christians) erreth in translating *Sheol* Hell, whereas the signification of the word is קבר or the Grave. To all which if we add the conformity of the word *Hades* in the parable concerning the rich man and *Lazarus*, together with the evidence we have before given of the like notion of *Hades*, both in that so oft refer'd to passage of Gods not leaving the Messiah's soul in hell, and in the Creed; So we shall have little reason to doubt either of *Sheol* or *Hades* signifying most generally and properly the place of departed Souls, or of the necessity of adhering to that sense of it in the Scripture, where there occurs not some particular circumstance to constrain us to depart from it. But from hence it will not be difficult to collect thirdly, that the word *Sheol* or *Hades* signifies indifferently the place of good or bad souls or both, and must accordingly be interpreted of either or both, as the circumstances of the text shall perswade: Not only the foremention'd interpretations of the Ancient Jews so perswading, but, which seems most to be under dispute, the application of this descent into hell to good men, as well as bad, and particularly (as I shall afterwards shew from a reason of St. Peter's) the *Plalmist's* applying it to the soul of the Messiah. By which means the only thing remaining to be enquir'd into, is when we are to understand this word *Hades* with reference to good or bad or both, because more than that will not be necessary to procure us a due understanding of it, or of that

\* Explic. of the word Christ.

<sup>f</sup> See The Answer to the Jesuites Chal. P. 317, 318.

*Article of our Creed*, for the explication whereof this whole discourse was instituted.

It is the affirmation of one *s* in the Greek *Anthology*, that one *Hades* receives all persons whatsoever; and so it appears that *Josephus* understood it when he affirm'd the *Sadducees* to take away all punishments and rewards or honours in *Hades*. But whether the Scripture ever make use of it in that notion, and if it doth, how we shall come to distinguish it from its more restrained ones, would be enquir'd into, though we shall not go far to seek for a resolution of either. For thus it is manifestly us'd by the *Psalmist* <sup>h</sup> where he enquires, *What man is he that liveth, and shall not see death? Shall he deliver his soul from the hand of the grave,* or (as it is in the *Hebrew* and in the *Septuagint*, and in our own *Old Translation* of the *Psalms*) *from the hand of hell?* For the *Psalmist* plainly intimating by that question of his, that no one sort of persons shall deliver his Soul from it, he both intimates a necessity of understanding *Hades* or *hell* in its more comprehensive sense; and points us so to understand it elsewhere, where it is thus made common to all men, or where (as it is in the passage of *Josephus* but now referr'd to) it is set to include the both punishments and rewards which are there awarded to departed souls. And in the same comprehensive sense possibly those passages also may have been primarily intended, where it is said by *Jacob* that his Sons would *bring down his gray hairs with sorrow to hell*, as by the *Psalmist* that God *would not leave the Messiah's soul in hell*, and by the *Creed* that *Christ descended into it*: The first of these requiring no other interpretation (as was before intimated) than that the Sons of *Jacob* should, by the miscarriage of *Benjamin* (if any such should happen) occasion his passing unto death, and so to that world of souls, as the *Hebrews* stile it; as the two latter, that *Christ* should, as other men do at their death, pass to the place of departed Souls, as well as to the grave, but that God should not suffer him long to continue either in the one or the other, but make those two parts of him his soul and flesh meet again and renew that union which had been broken. But because this general *Hades* is, by the confession of *Greeks*, and *Jews*, and *Christians*, divided into two apartments, sutable to the different demerits of those that enter into it; and because therefore no one can pass into that great house of departed Souls, but he must pass into one of those two apartments, or rather, not become an inhabitant of it at all, but by setting his foot into one of these; Therefore it will be but reasonable to enquire, whether *Hades* be not sometime taken with a more particular reference to one of these, but however which of these is to be understood, where the Scripture speaks of mens entring into either. In order to the resolution whereof, I will first propose some texts where the word *Hades* is restrainedly taken, and withal mark out the Characteristicks by which it is to be known. But such I should think that *Hades* or *Hell* to be, concerning which *Solomon* affirms, that *That and destruction are before the Lord*; <sup>Prov. 15. 11.</sup> how much more the hearts of the children of men, and particularly of those sinful ones, whom he speaks of in the verse before; and whom he there threatens with vengeance? For being hell is there joined with אבדון or *Abaddon*, which if it do not denote the devil (who is elsewhere <sup>Rev. 9. 11.</sup> stil'd by that name) yet doth a miserable portion, it is but reasonable to understand it of the hell of evil Souls; and where they meet with a punishment sutable to their evil demerits. But so therefore shall we find it



requisite to understand that *Hades* or *Hell* in which the *rich man* in the *Parable* is plac'd, because describ'd as a *place of torments*, yea to such a degree, that that rich man could not but bewail the misfortune of his brethren who were not as yet there, but whose past miscarriages gave him cause to believe that they would *come into that place of torments*. Which passages, as they shew how we may judge of those other places of Scripture, where the hell of the damned is meant, to wit either by the company there is there, or the condition they are in, so will also give us to understand in part how the word *hell*, though it import no uncomfortable thing in it self, yet came at length to be appropriated to the hell of the damned: The torments that are sometime said to be there, as that too on the major part of mankind (because the major part are sinners) bringing the word at length into such disgrace, that men could not find in their heart to give it a better sense. For that our English word *hell* was not always of so ill a sound, may appear from the use of it in that *Translation* of the *Psalms*, which is as yet retain'd in our *Common Prayer Books*. For when the *Psalmist* is there brought in asking *what man is he* that shall not see both *death* and *hell*, it plainly shews that that word was of a more comprehensive, yea better sense, because it is certain that all shall not come to that *worser* hell. Not to say, that the like is evident from a passage in a *Saxon* discourse concerning *the Old Testament*, written above 700. years since, and where it is affirm'd of *Adam*, that, *after he had lived nine hundred years, he went with sorrow into hell*. For being it was never affirm'd by any, who was not a reputed Heretick, that *Adam* went to the *hell* of the *damned*, but rather the contrary<sup>1</sup>, it seems but reasonable to believe, that by *hell* in that passage is meant the place appointed for departed souls whether they be good or bad. And indeed though it be hard to find any one text of Scripture, where this word *Hades* is so particularly appropriated to the place of good Souls, as we find it sometimes is to the place of bad; Yet when it is apparant that *good* men are said to go, thither<sup>m</sup> as well as *bad*, and no less apparant from the Scripture that good men go to a place of happiness, that *Hades* to which good men are said to go, must consequently connote those happy mansions wherein they are bestow'd, because these cannot be suppos'd to go to any other *Hades*. Which, if well attended to, will open us a way for the right interpreting of that passage of the *Psalmist*, wherein he implies the passing of the *Messiah's* Soul into *hell*, and together therewith (because built upon it) the *Creeeds* affirming the same *Messiah's* *descending* into it. For it will appear first from that passage of the *Psalmist*, consider'd as expounded by *St. Peter*, that we are by no means to understand by *hell*, the *hell of the damned*, as many of the Ancients, and not a few of our own have understood it: Partly upon the account of what *St. Peter* urgeth as to the not understanding that passage concerning *David*; and partly, upon the account of that humble state, which the being in hell, by the *Psalmist's* language, must be thought to import. For if by *hell* in that place were meant the *hell of the damned*, how unnecessary must it needs have been, that I say not also improper for *St. Peter* to make it his business to shew, that that place could not be understood of *David*? There being not any the least presumption of so holy a man as *David* ever going to that place of torments. Of not unlike force, in my opinion, is that humble state which *Hell* must be there thought to imply, when God is brought in so graciously promising that he would *not leave Christ's Soul* there:

<sup>1</sup> *Iren. adv. heres.*, li. 3. c. 34.

<sup>m</sup> *Gen.* 37. 35.  
— 42. 38.

there: Because they, who believe the *hell of the damned* to be there understood, do not suppose Christ to have passed thither to suffer any thing, but, on the contrary, to triumph gloriously over those evil Spirits that are there; Which is neither suitable to that humble state, which the *Psalmist* seems to imply in it, nor yet so proper for that time, as for that wherein he arose from the dead, and after that ascended into Heaven. Being therefore the *hell of the damned* cannot be understood either by the *Psalmist* or the *Creed*, being there is no other region beside that for departed Souls to repair to, but only that of holy Souls; that *Hades*, or *hell*, into which Christ is said to go, must be supposed to be that part of it, wherein Holy Souls are bestow'd. A thing which stands yet farther confirmed to us by the promise of *Christ* to the penitent *thief*, that *he should be with him that very day in Paradise*. For as it is certain from thence, that it should not be long after that promise, ere the Soul of our Saviour should be in *Paradise*; so being that *Paradise* in the opinion of the *Jews*, with whose language our Saviour must be thought to have corresponded in his, was the place of holy Souls; being, as appears by *Josephus's* mention of rewards as well as punishments in *Hades*, according to the opinion of the same *Jews*, that *Paradise* was a part of it; it remains that we understand that very *Paradise* to be the *Hades*, into which the Soul of our Saviour passed. Only, because the making of that *Paradise* to be the *Hades* meant, may seem to be inconsistent with that humble state, which the *Psalmist* seems to imply, and no less inconsistent with St. *Peter's* affirming God by the resurrection of our Saviour to have *lost the pains of death*, or, as some read it, *of Hades*; I think it but just to say somewhat unto each, before I leave the Explication of that *Article* which I am now upon. Luc. 23. 43

And here, not, in any measure, to deny what is so apparant from Christ's *hope* of being delivered from hell, as well as from God's promise of *not leaving* him there; I shall desire it may be consider'd first, that, as the most proper time of our Saviour's humiliation was not without an admixture of comfort and honour, as appears from that *Angel* which was sent to *strengthen* him in his Agony; so we have much less reason to conceive those comforts and honours to be deni'd him, after he had finished that painful work which he came into the world to do. For beside that *that was* no improper season for comfort and honour, which came after the completing of that Tragedy; neither was that burial of his, which followed it, and is here join'd with his descending into hell, without an admixture of glory and triumph, as well as of ingloriousness and debasement. For though this great person was brought so low as the *grave*, yea into a society, in some measure, with the *wicked* in it; yet in regard of his past innocence, and exemplary vertue, he was allowed by God to make his grave *yet more* with the *rich* and honourable, and so receive an exaltation, as well as a debasement by it. Which suppos'd, why should we think it any more strange that his Soul should meet with the same fortune, and partake of the comforts and glories of *Paradise*, as well as of the debasements of *Hades*? But because even from what we have now answered, as well as from Gods promise of *not leaving* our Saviour in it, it will follow that there is some kind of ingloriousness even in *Paradise*, which the generality of men, led thereto by the consideration of the great happiness thereof, will find it not easy to apprehend; and because too the fore-mention'd difficulty cannot well be solv'd, without the both shewing that ingloriousness,

<sup>4</sup> Answer to the  
Jesuits Chall. p.  
390.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. 15. 26.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. 15. 54.  
<sup>55</sup>  
<sup>1</sup> Heb. 11. 40.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. 15.  
54. &c.

<sup>2</sup> Mat. 25. 41.

<sup>7</sup> Mat. 8. 29.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Pet. 2. 4.

<sup>1</sup> Jude 6.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Pet. 2. 9.

ingloriousness, and the consistency thereof with its certain happiness; Therefore I will now let my self to shew both the one and the other, and (because his Authority (as it ought) will go far with some men) in the words of the *Reverend Primate* so often mentioned. For though he in that discourse of his hath advanced other notions of *Hades*, and which his great reading enabled him, more than any man, to maintain; Yet doth he not stick to acknowledge <sup>1</sup> that the word *Hades* is of so large a capacity, that *Heaven* it self may be compris'd within the notion thereof: *Heaven*, I say (for I speak his own words) not considered as it is a place of life and perfection, nor as it shall be after the general resurrection, but so far forth only as *Death* (the last enemy that shall be destroyed <sup>2</sup>) hath any footing therein, that is to say, as it is the receptacle of the spirits of dead men, held as yet dissevered from their bodies; Which state of dissolution (though carried to heaven it self) is still a part of death's victory <sup>3</sup> and the Saints' imperfection. For the farther evidencing whereof the first thing that I shall propose is, that, though the Souls of holy men go to bliss immediately after their departure hence, and consequently so also did the Soul of *Christ*, yet must their happiness be look'd upon as imperfect, as long as their bodies are separated from them. For being the body is a part of man, and together with the Soul makes up one person, so long as the body is separated from the Soul, and held under corruption, so long the happiness of that person, how great soever in one respect, must needs be incomplete and imperfect. As the foremention'd *Prelate* speaks, our happiness all that while hath the footsteps of death upon it, it is, though a happiness, yet a happiness with an alloy. And accordingly *St. Paul* <sup>4</sup> makes the time of the resurrection the time of our triumph over death and *Hades*. For when (saith he) this corruptible shall put on incorruption, and this mortal shall put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written; *Death is swallowed up in Victory*. O death where is thy sting, O grave (so we read it, but it is in the Greek, O *Hades* or hell) where is thy Victory? Now forasmuch as the Soul is, though happy, yet imperfectly so, till the body be reunited to it, we may easily suppose our Saviour to comfort himself in hope of not being left in that place; because, during the time of his bodies absence from it, a place, though of happiness, yet of an imperfect one. I say secondly, that, though the Souls of men are happy or unhappy immediately after their departure out of this world; yet is there presumption enough of that happiness, or unhappiness, being in it self inferiour to that, which they shall be possess'd of at the last day: For how first, for the bad, can any man think their unhappiness at the highest immediately after their departure hence, when we find the devils, for whom we know hell was <sup>5</sup> primarily prepar'd, asking our Saviour whether he were come to torment them before the time? When conformably thereto, we find both *St. Peter* <sup>6</sup> and *St. Jude* <sup>7</sup> affirming also, that they are reserv'd in chains of darkness unto the judgment of the great day? Lastly, when we find *St. Peter* <sup>8</sup> affirming the same of wicked men; even that they are reserv'd unto the day of judgment to be punished. On the other side, for good men, who can think but that their happiness also is inferiour to that which they shall hereafter be possess'd of, when we find *St. Paul* himself placing his great consolation in the expectation of that crown of righteousness which shall at the same time be bestow'd upon him and all those that love *Christ's* appearing? For henceforth (saith that

Apo-



Apostle <sup>c</sup>) *there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord* <sup>2 Tim. 4. 8.</sup> *the righteous judge shall give me at that day, and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing.* Now forasmuch as the present happiness of good Souls, no less than the present unhappiness of bad, is incompleat and imperfect; forasmuch as the Soul of Christ must be concluded to have been under that imperfect state until his resurrection from the grave; we may easily suppose him to comfort himself with the *hopes* of *not being left* in it, without interpreting *hell* in the present sense of the word, because though he was then in happiness, yet under an imperfect one. One only objection there is against this exposition of the present Article, even that which is founded in St. Peter's affirming God, by the *resurrection* of our Saviour, to have *loosed the pains of death* <sup>d</sup> or <sup>d</sup> *A. 2. 24.* (as it is in some Copies) the *pains of Hades*. But beside that there is little pretence for this latter reading, if we compare those few Copies, wherein it is <sup>e</sup>, with those many that embrace the other; I do not see, considering the imperfectness of that state, and the inclination the Soul of man may be suppos'd to have towards its ancient companion, and its more perfect glory, but that those *pains of death* or *Hades* may be allowed to have taken hold of our Saviour, and yet no way destroy that happiness which is there. For neither, where there is so strong an inclination to its old companion, and a farther degree of happiness, can we well suppose the suspension of the satisfaction of it without some little regret, and a kind of *travail* of mind to be possessed of it; and much less wonder at it, in so imperfect, though happy, an estate. Especially when that regret is appeas'd by the assured hopes of hereafter attaining it, and those unspeakable joys, which God doth in the mean time entertain the mind of man with, and take off from the troublesome of that inclination by. Which yet I should not have affirm'd (such is my jealousy of any thing to which the ears of men have not been accustomed) were it not that I was encouraged thereto by St. John <sup>f</sup> in whom I seemed to my self to have <sup>f</sup> *Rev. 6. 9, 10,* met with such a resolution. For not only doth he there bring in the *souls* <sup>11.</sup> *of them that were slain for the word of God and the testimony that they held, crying out, How long Lord holy and true, dost thou not judge, and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth;* but assure us, that, upon that expostulation of theirs, *white robes were given them, and they bidden to rest yet for a little season, until their fellow servants and brethren, that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled.* For then they should find themselves satisfied to the full, as to that, and all other things to which they could be supposed to aspire. And if we grant the Soul of our Saviour to have been under such a *travail* of mind, (for the word we render *pains* signifies the *pains of a woman in travail*) and under a desire to be reunited to its ancient body, and so possessed of that far greater glory that had been promis'd him, I see not wherein it may be thought to be inconsistent with the happiness of that place, to which he is affirmed by us to have pass'd; and much less any necessity, for the bare mention of those *pains of hell*, of seeking out any other *Hades*, than that which *Paradise* takes up.

3. Now as after I have thus shewn what is meant by Christ's *descending into hell*, nothing remains for me to do but to shew what the *ends* of that descent were; so, the former being established, it will not be difficult to conjecture what those *ends* of his descent were. For considering the word *Hades* or *hell* in its more general notion, and as it imports the place

place whither all departed Souls repair, so the end of this descent will be *his farther conforming to the law of that nature which he assum'd*. For inasmuch as Christ took upon him the *form of a man*, yea even to the state of *death*, it was but agreeable to his former design, during the time of his humiliation, to suffer, as his dead body to be dispos'd of as other mens bodies are, so his Soul to pass into the usual receptacle of Souls, and so give a farther proof both of the truth of his humane nature, and his own perfect humiliation under it. And this end of our Saviours descent is so natural and clear, that, as *several* learned men have observed <sup>g</sup>, it hath been generally preserv'd in the writings of the *Ancients*, notwithstanding the many differences among them, both concerning that place into which he did descend, and the other ends of it. On the other side if we consider the word *Hades*, and our Saviours *descent* into it, as his passing to the *place of holy Souls*, and that happiness to which they are admitted (for neither can any man become an inhabitant of *Hades*, but by entering into the *one or other apartment* of it) so we may suppose it to have been first, to receive a *foretast of that great glory*, which he had merited by the work of our redemption. Our Saviour had, as *St. Paul* spake <sup>h</sup>, *fought his good fight and finished his course*, or, as he himself expressed it, *had finished the work which God had given him to do*. But the time was not yet come, when he should take full possession of *that glory which he had with God before the world was*. His body, by the agreement that pass'd between him and his father, and the predictions of the Prophets, was to continue some time in the grave, and his Soul in the usual receptacle of departed Souls. In the mean while therefore, according to the law of separated Souls, he receiv'd that happiness which was proper to that State, and to which all holy Souls are carried. Only as when it is so clear, that Our Saviour had, in all things, an eye to the welfare of men, as well as to his own happiness, it will be hard to exclude that design from having a place even in this *passage* of his to *Hades*; So I see not, why I may not represent it as also probable, that he went thither to give those *holy fathers*, that died before him, *the satisfaction of enjoying his presence* whom they had in their life-time so *desir'd to see*, and a farther assurance of bringing their Souls to a reunion with their bodies, and so to a more perfect redemption: This, as it is in it self no improbable account of his passing into *Paradise*, nor unlikely in the person of him, who so far lov'd them as to die for them; so becoming yet more probable by the actual assurance he gave them of it, in his own retiring again from their Company, and carrying *some of them* away with him <sup>k</sup> to be partakers of his resurrection, as well as to be an ornament both of it and his triumphal ascent. However it be, nothing hinders us to profess, that as Christ's body, after his death, was dispos'd of in the grave, as other the bodies of deceased men are, so, by the law of the same human nature, his Soul was carry'd to that place, where other departed Souls are carried; Contenting himself, during his three days humiliation, with that imperfect happiness, which the Souls of holy men are under, till the general resurrection from the dead. Though if even this will not please, let the Reader in Gods name recede so far from it, as his own judgment shall direct him; Provided, he do not deny the *Article* it self, which hath the clear concurrence of the *Scripture*. For if, as *St. Peter* <sup>l</sup> informs us, that Prophecy of our Saviour's being *not left in hell* was fulfilled in his *resurrection* from the dead, then was he in *hell* (whatsoever the

<sup>g</sup> See Answer to the Jesuits Chal. p. 381. Sec. and Pearson on the Creed, pag. 508. ed. 4.

<sup>h</sup> 2 Tim. 4. 7.

<sup>i</sup> Joh. 17. 4.

<sup>k</sup> Mat. 27. 52, 53.

<sup>l</sup> Act. 2. 31.

the meaning thereof be) before his resurrection, and consequently, was not only *dead*, and *buried*, but *descended into hell*.

## **The third Day he rose again from the Dead.**

### **The Contents.**

*After a declaration of the impossibility of Christ's being holden under the power of death, in respect of that divine nature to which he was united, it is shewn that he actually rose from the dead, as it made appear from his having been before really dead, and as really alive after it. The evidences we have of the latter of these, and why our Saviour shewed himself alive, rather to witnesses chosen before of God, than to the world. By what power this Saviour of ours was raised from the dead, which is shewn to be by the power of the father and his own; as also that he rose from the dead the third day. The agreement of that resurrection of his with the Prophecies of the Old Testament, both in it self, and as to the distance of it from his death. The conclusion of the whole, with the ends of our Saviour's resurrection, as to himself and us.*

**W**E have hitherto beheld our Saviour under an inglorious estate, **The third** we have seen him *dead* and *buried*, and *descended into hell*; **Day he** This Son of righteousness, like the natural one, not only set- **rose again** ting in a red Cloud, but retiring himself under the earth: Let us now, as **from the** the sequel of the Creed admonisheth us, behold him in his rise from that **Dead.** bed of *earth* and *Hades*. For as it was impossible that he should be holden under the power of either, who was united to an immortal seed; so both the *Creed* and *St. Paul* assure us, that when the time prefixed, **even** *the third day*, was come, he shook off those Chains of darkness, and rose again, as the Scriptures had foretold. **1 Cor. 15. 41**

In the handling of which Article I will proceed in this method, **I. I** will shew, as was but now intimated, that it was not possible for Christ to be holden under the power of death.

2. The truth of his resurrection from it.
3. By what power it was effected.
4. The distance of that resurrection from his death.
5. The agreement of both with the Scriptures of the Old Testament.
6. And lastly, the ends of that his resurrection from the dead.

**I.** It is the Affirmation of *St. Peter*, where he speaks concerning the *loosing* those *pains of death* which had seiz'd upon our Saviour, that it



Act. 2. 24. *was not possible that he should be holden of it :* And so we shall find it, whether we consider that death, with reference to him that inflicted it, or with reference to him that underwent it ; as a thing no way seemly for God to continue him under, or for the Son himself to undergo. Of the former of these I cannot well avoid to speak, when I come to entreat of the *ends* of our Saviour's resurrection, and therefore I will at present insist only upon that impossibility, which is founded upon the divinity of the sufferer. For supposing, as we have before shewn, that he is *God of God*, partaker of the same Divine Nature with the Father, and replenish'd with his infinite perfections, and it will not be possible for us to apprehend, that he should so fall under death, as to continue for ever under the power of it ; because neither can we apprehend any debasement to be consistent with the Majesty of God, unless it tend to the farther illustration of his glory : Glory, though it be no part of his nature or perfections, yet being due unto him because of them, and which therefore he cannot part with without *denying himself* and them, which

2 Tim. 2. 13. we know from the Scripture <sup>c</sup> to be utterly impossible to him. Which, as it will give us an account of the reasonableness of those debasements which this Son of God in the *dayes of his flesh* submitted himself to ; So will satisfy us of the impossibility of his falling under such a debasement as a never ending death will amount unto. For though it was no derogation to his Majesty to assume a weak nature and die, because the great mercy he shewed in it, and the power he manifested in raising himself from it, tended more to the illustration of his glory, than that debasement could be thought to depress him ; Yet must it be accounted a derogation, to lie for ever under the power of death, as to which no motive could be thought sufficient to induce him, and which, by the continuance of it, leaves as lasting a reproach upon his power : It being not to be suppos'd, that any being will, without a sufficient reason, lie under that debasement, which it is in its power to deliver it self from. And though, after what the Scripture hath said concerning the *impossibility of God's denying himself* (which is the thing, upon which this whole argumentation proceeds) there may seem no need at all of alledging any other proof for it ; Yet I think it not amiss to add, that it is as consonant to our reason, as it is to that *other voice* of God : There being, in the apprehension of all men, a certain justice that is due from every one to himself, and which he can no more depart from, than he can invade the rights of others. As indeed well may we so reason, when as *Tully* <sup>d</sup> hath well observ'd, whatsoever hath the reputation of honest or vertuous is founded on it ; Honest being nothing else than what is futable to the excellency of that nature which doth it, as dishonest, than what is unfutable to it. For if that futableness be the very *formality* of all that is honest or vertuous, neither can we suppose any thing to depart from that futableness, without the imputation of a crime ; nor therefore (because no such can fall upon the Divine Nature) imagine the most excellent being to do or suffer any thing, which holds not correspondence with its own greatness. Since therefore it is impossible for a divine being to *deny* or *act unfutably* to its own greatness ; since it must be look'd upon as such to submit to a never ending death, as to which there can be no sufficient motive, and which is, beside that, a lasting reproach unto his power ; It must be look'd upon as utterly impossible for the Son of God, either to submit himself to the imposition of such a death, or suffer himself to continue under

<sup>d</sup> De Officiis  
lib. 1.

der the power of *that*, under which he hath thought good to fall.

II. But because whatever evidence there may be, from *reason*, of the impossibility of Christ's being holden under the power of death, and consequently also of his rising from it; Yet that resurrection as to its *particular circumstances* cannot at all be evinced by it, and may moreover, (because a matter of fact,) be more naturally prov'd by testimony: Therefore proceed we to a more direct establishment of it, and, together therewith, of our own faith and confidence in him. Now there are two things which are requisite to shew the truth of any resurrection, and more than which cannot be requir'd to evince the truth of *Christ's* or any other; the truth of his having *died*, who is said to rise again, and his being really *alive* after it. For as he cannot be said to have risen from the dead, who either was not before dead, or was not afterwards alive; So cannot he be said not to have risen from the dead, concerning whom both these things may be demonstrated: He, who was dead, and is alive again, necessarily passing from death to life, which is the proper notion of a resurrection. If therefore it may appear that our Saviour did really and truly die, if it may appear that he was afterwards alive again, it follows that we believe him to have risen from the dead as the Scripture and the Creed represent him to us.

1. The judicious *Hooker* in the entrance of his *first book of Ecclesiastical Polity* tells us, that he had endeavoured so to order his discourse, that every former part might give strength to all that follows, and every latter part bring some light to all before. In conformity to which method as it was but necessary for me to proceed in the *Explication* of the *Creed*, between the truths whereof there is so strait a connexion and dependance; so the reasonableness of so doing will appear more particularly in that, which comes first to be pointed to, even the truth of our Saviours death. For, as having before establish'd the truth of that death, I have given strength to the *Article* of his *resurrection*, and consequently superseded so much of my pains concerning it; So by laying open before you the several things which a resurrection supposeth, and particularly a true and real death before it, I have thereby made appear, what was before hinted, that it was not unnecessary to insist so much, as I then did, upon the truth of our Saviours death; the truth of our Saviours resurrection manifestly depending on it. Taking it therefore for granted, as having before demonstrated it, that *Christ* did really and truly die, as also, that (how little soever at present controverted) it was not unnecessary to insist upon the probation of it, I proceed, without more ado, to shew that he was alive after that death, the second thing which a resurrection implies.

2. We left our Saviour, as one would have thought, safe enough in his grave; for he, who had the *humanity* shall I say, or rather *piety* to bestow him there, had *rolled a great stone to the door of it*: Whether it were, for the common reason of such coverings, to preserve his body from the either curious eyes or affronts of men, or whether it were, as it is not unlikely where there was fear enough from wild beasts, to preserve it also from becoming a prey to them. For *Busbequius* tells us that the Turks do for that reason lay a great stone upon the Sepulchres of the deceased; it being not unusual for Wolves, but especially for the *hyana*, to dig up the bodies of men, and carry them, as those of other creatures, to their dens. However it were, sure we are that a great stone

\* Mat. 27. 60

\* Twic. Epist. 1.

was rolled to the mouth of his Sepulchre, and which (if the chains of death could not) might, one would have thought, have kept him safe enough. But the Jews, who had heard of *this* supposed deceivers affirming *that after the third day he would rise again*, were not satisfied with this security. For who could tell, but that his Disciples, to procure credit to their Master's affirmation, might within that time *take him away*, and, because his dead body did not appear, give out that *he was risen from the dead*? Pilate therefore, who had gratified them so far as to deliver him to death upon their importunity, must be solicited to give them leave to make the Sepulchre yet more sure, which accordingly Pilate yielded to, and they as readily put in execution: Not only *setting a strong guard* of men to prevent any attempt of his Disciples<sup>b</sup>, but *sealing the stone* too, lest this supposed guard should be brib'd into a confederacy with his Disciples, and so defeat all their diligence. For so it pleased God, who doth not seldom bring good out of evil, to convert the evil purposes of men to the confirmation of his own, and make that diligence of theirs a farther proof of *Christ's* body not being taken away by any other hands, than those which brought his Soul back to it. For whilst this guard was intent upon their charge, and neither feared either the dead or the living, a great earthquake shook the ground first and then their minds; which were afterwards disordered by the apparition of an *Angel*<sup>c</sup> or *Angels*<sup>k</sup>: For these had not only come down to *roll away the stone* from the Sepulchre<sup>l</sup>, but to let those women understand that he was not now *among the dead*<sup>m</sup> but among the *living*. Which was farther confirm'd to them by the view of the Sepulchre<sup>n</sup>, which (as well guarded as it but now was) had nothing of him but his grave-clothes, and by the view of that Lord himself<sup>o</sup>, who appear'd to them as they were going to his Disciples to give them an account of what they had seen and heard. But by this means, (if I may take the boldness to impose an interpretation upon a *Prophecy* that hath not had many good ones) that of the Prophet *Isay*<sup>p</sup> was fulfill'd, *He was taken from prison and from judgment, and who shall declare his generation*? For he was cut off from the land of the living, for the transgression of my people was he stricken: The grave, especially when guarded as it was, being properly enough still'd a *prison*, and, which is more, the only restraint we can find to have befallen our Saviour, or indeed understand here; Because the Prophet assigns no other argument, either of the greatness of that deliverance, or of the difficulty of *declaring his generation* thereupon, than the death he suffered from his enemies, which shews that to have been the thing, which brought upon him that restraint, from which he is here affirmed to be taken. But by this means we may also attain a much clearer understanding of that *generation* whereof the *Propbet* speaks, and of the Prophet's asking, as by way of confusion and wonderment, *who shall declare it*. For as it must be confess'd (if we will allow the Prophet to speak coherently) that this *generation* whereof he speaks hapned unto him either in, or upon his being *taken from prison, and from judgment*; So what *generation* therefore can we so well understand as that *generation* which he had from *the womb* of the grave? Especially when this is so clearly the language of the Scripture, that St. Paul in one place<sup>q</sup> makes use of no other proof of Christ's resurrection than those words of the Psalmist, *Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee*, and elsewhere<sup>r</sup> styles him *the first born from the dead*,

<sup>a</sup> Mat. 27. 62.  
 &c.

<sup>b</sup> Mat. 27. 66.

<sup>c</sup> Mat. 28. 2.

<sup>k</sup> Luc. 24. 4.

<sup>l</sup> Mat. 28. 2.

<sup>m</sup> ——— 6.

Luc. 24. 5, 6.

<sup>n</sup> Mat. 28. 6.

<sup>o</sup> ——— 9.

<sup>p</sup> Isa. 53. 8.

<sup>q</sup> Act. 13. 33.

<sup>r</sup> Col. 1. 18.



dead. And if the resurrection of Christ may pass for a *generation*, it may also, if it were only for the rarity of it, pass for a wonderful one, and concerning which the Prophet might well ask, *who shall*, or shall be able to *declare* it; this being a *generation* wherewith the world had not been much acquainted, and which was indeed so difficult to declare according to its worth and greatness, that men found it hard to admit it into their belief, after all the assurance that Christianity had given them of it.

But to return to that, from which I have diverted, even the evidence we have of our Saviours being *alive* after his death and burial; where in the next place I will take notice of the proofs our Saviour gave of it to those whom he call'd *Apostles*, and so much the rather because these were chosen by himself to be witnesses <sup>1</sup> of it, and, that they might have the credit of such, enabled to work such miracles as no power less than Divine could produce. For if these were intended as his principal witnesses, there is no doubt he would give them a due information of the thing they were to attest, and withal take care that their testimony should be so deliver'd down to the world, that they should have no need to doubt after it. Taking it therefore for granted, that here, if any where, we must find the due proofs of his being alive, I will set my self to the consideration of it, and confine all my enquiries within it. It is a known passage that of St. *Luke* <sup>2</sup>, and may well serve for an introduction to this Argument, that Christ *shewed himself to the Apostles alive after his passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days*. Of the former part of this testimony there can be no doubt, each of the other *Evangelists* and St. *Paul* concurring <sup>3</sup> with them in it, withal making mention of the times and places in which he thus shewed himself unto them. The only thing which may be worthy of an enquiry, is whether in those appearances he gave them such proofs of his being alive, that they had no reasonable ground to doubt of it. Now there are three things which will make it evident that Christ shewed himself to the Apostles, that they had no reason to doubt of the truth of his being alive,

1. That he shewed himself to them at several times.
2. That he shewed himself to them as well all together, as <sup>2</sup> part, or in lesser numbers.
3. That, when he shewed himself to them, he gave them certain proofs of his being no *spirit*, yea of his being the same Jesus that was crucifi'd.

1. And first of all I observe, that our Saviour shewed himself to the Apostles at *several times*, so that if at one time they could not have had opportunity to satisfy themselves concerning him, yet they might have had opportunity enough at another. He shewed himself to them the very same day <sup>1</sup> he rose from the dead; he shewed himself unto them the next Lord's day <sup>2</sup> after. He shewed himself to several of them again when they went together *a fishing* <sup>3</sup>, and last of all when he was taken <sup>4</sup> up from them <sup>5</sup> into heaven; at which time moreover he led them out as far as *Bethany*, and there took his solemn leave of them. And can we then doubt of the truth of his being, the crucified Jesus that appear'd to them, who appear'd to them so many several times? Had it not been easie for them in all that time to have detected the cheat, if there had been any such? especially being so jealous as they were of one, and having one among the rest so diffident that he would not give the least entertainment to it, till he had thrust his hand into his wounds?

2. I observe secondly, that as our Saviour appear'd to the Apostles at several times, so to *them* again as well *all together* and in *greater numbers*, as *apart* or in *lesser ones*. The first of the appearances before mentioned was to all the disciples but St. *Thomas*, the second to him together with the other. The third to no less than *seven* of them, and those too none of the least considerable, and the last to all of them and more, even to five hundred brethren as St. *Paul* instructs<sup>b</sup> us, that being no doubt the time he took his solemn leave of them. A consideration which cannot but be thought to be of signal force toward the evincing the truth of his being alive. For though *single* they might have been abus'd, yet who could think they could be so when *all together*, and when they had both the encouragement and the assistance of each other?

<sup>b</sup> 1 Cor. 15. 6.

3. I observe thirdly, that when this Saviour of ours shewed himself unto the Apostles, he gave them certain proofs of his being no *spirit*, yea of his being the very *same* Jesus that had been crucifi'd. *Handle me and see* (saith the holy *Jesus*<sup>c</sup> to his Disciples when they were affrighted at one of his appearances) *for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have*; or if that will not do, give me something to *eat*<sup>d</sup>, that I may thereby prove my self to be no Spirit. They did so, saith St. *Luke*<sup>e</sup>, *giving him a piece of a broiled fish and of an honey comb, which he took and did eat before them*. But it may be, that, though no Spirit, yet he was not the *same* Jesus that was crucified, but one who personated that sacred person. Behold therefore a proof of that also, *Behold my hands and my feet*, saith our Saviour<sup>f</sup> to those disciples of his that were then assembled together, even those hands and feet that were pierced with nails, and fastned to the accursed tree, or if you will not trust your eyes, yet let your touch make proof of it, and free you from these vain scruples, *Handle me and see*, for so he goes on in the place before; but to St. *Thomas*, who was a little more diffident than the rest, *Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side, and be not faithless but believing*. Though, if even this may not be thought sufficient to shew him to have been the *mighty*, as well as the *crucified* Jesus, the majesty which attended him in those appearances will; witness his presenting himself among them *when the doors*<sup>h</sup> *were shut*, the great *multitude of fishes* he enabled St. *Peter*<sup>i</sup> and the rest of his companions to inclose, the *warm influence*<sup>k</sup> his discourse had upon those two Disciples to whom he join'd himself as they were going to *Emmans*, and his *vanishing* presently after *out of their sight*<sup>l</sup>, even when *their eyes were opened* to see and acknowledge him, and last of all his *ascending up* in their presence *into heaven*. For if these relations may be credited, nothing can be more evident than that he gave them proof enough both of his being *alive* and of his being the very *same* Jesus, and consequently also of his *resurrection* from the dead.

<sup>c</sup> Luc. 24. 39.

<sup>d</sup> — 41.

<sup>e</sup> — 42, 43.

<sup>f</sup> Luc. — 39.

<sup>g</sup> Joh. 20. 27.

<sup>h</sup> Joh. 20. 19.

<sup>i</sup> — 21. 6.

<sup>k</sup> Luc. 24. 32.

<sup>l</sup> — 31.

\*Μετὰ ταῦτα ὁ Κέλσος ἐν κειμένῳ τῷ γεγραμμένῳ κακολογῶν, φησὶν, ὅτι ἐχρὲν, ἵνα τῷ ὄντι, ὁ Χριστὸς δύναμιον ἐκφάνῃ ἡδυνάειν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἐπηρώδοις, καὶ τῷ καταδεδειγμένῳ, καὶ ὅλοις πᾶσι ὁρῶναι. Vid. Orig. contra Celsum li. 2. pag. 98.

But here it may be demanded, because the like was sometime done by *Celsus*<sup>\*</sup>, why, supposing there was no deceit in our Saviours apparitions, he did not shew himself to *others* as well as to his *Apostles* and followers, yea to those who had abus'd and condemn'd him. For

was it not expedient to have his resurrection as publick as his sufferings

and

and reproaches? Nay was there not greater reason for that, being so extremely difficult to believe, and at that time also judg'd impossible? Did not the same *Christ* when provoked by an *evil and adulterous generation* to give them a *sign*, make answer that *no sign<sup>m</sup> should be given them* <sup>Mat. 12. 39.</sup> *but the sign of the Prophet Jonas, or rather one which was conformable to it*, and doth he now conceal that also from them, and refer them for the truth of it to his own Disciples? I trow *he did not now fear<sup>a</sup> any man having once died, and now* (as the Christians said) *become a God*, that he should be shy of shewing himself, *neither was he sent that he should lie hid*. For answer to which we are first to know, that it is true enough that our Saviour did not appear so publicly after his resurrection as he did before, but not at all (for ought the Scriptures inform us) to the unbelieving Jews, and to the Apostles rather than to other believers: It being the affirmation of St. Peter<sup>o</sup>, that *God having raised him up the third day shewed him openly, not to all the people, but to witnesses chosen before of God*, even to him and the rest of the Apostles. But as this hinders not but he might give others sufficient proof of his resurrection, even by the testimony of those his witnesses, and the seal that he and the father set to it by the many miracles he enabled them to work, so might there be reason enough, for his not manifesting himself to the *world*, no nor yet to all believers alike. For the evidencing whereof, or at least of the former part of it, I shall propose to consideration those signal words of our Blessed Saviour<sup>p</sup>: Where upon occasion of his saying, *Tet a little<sup>p</sup> while, and the world seeth me no more, but ye shall*, meaning after his resurrection from the dead; and one of his Disciples asking him thereupon, what was the reason *he would not manifest himself to the world*, as well as to them; he, as being a *Jew*, looking after a present manifestation of him as a temporal Messiah; Christ made answer, that *if any man lov'd him, he would keep his words, and his father would love him, and he and the father come and make their abode with him*, thereby intimating, that the reason of his not exhibiting himself to the world, was because the world did *not love him, nor keep his commandments*; They that did *that*, failing not of a return, nor of a revelation of his and his fathers secrets. And can any man wonder that our Saviour should not *manifest* himself to the world, when he found that so much estranged from his love? Nay would it not have been a much greater wonder to have shew'd himself to any such? For though his own gracious nature and doctrine could not but incline him to love his enemies, and manifest his resurrection to them, yet he might do that, without appearing personally to them, and making them eye-witnesses of it. He might, as was before intimated, do that by the preaching of his Apostles, and by those miracles he enabled them to work; These giving a sufficient testimony to the doctrine they delivered, and consequently to his resurrection also. And if there were no necessity of his appearing personally to the world, there was much less of congruity, whatever *Celsus* or other such like might fancy to the contrary. For who could think it proper for our Saviour, to honour those men with his appearance, who had shew'd themselves to be his and his fathers enemies, yea continu'd even then in the same opposition to them? The case was far otherwise with those *Apostles* to whom he had shew'd himself, and made eye and ear-witnesses both of his appearances and discourses. For these had given up their names to him, when he was despis'd by all the world beside, they had left all for him, and were

now

<sup>a</sup> ὅτι ἴτι ἰσο-  
βῆτο τινάδω-  
πρατω ἀπο-  
θανῶν, ὃ (ὅς  
ἐστὶ) θεός  
οὐκ ἔσθ' ἰσχυ-  
ρὸν ἐπιμαθεῖν  
τὸ δεχθῆναι, ἵνα  
λάβῃ. Verba  
sunt Celsi apud  
Orig. li. 2. pag.  
101.  
<sup>o</sup> Act. 10. 40,  
41.  
<sup>p</sup> Joh. 14. 19.  
8cc.



now ready to lay down their lives also: And then no wonder, that, where there was so great a difference in the temper of the *Apostles* and *the world*, he also made a difference between them, and shewed himself to the one and not unto the other. Other reasons might be assign'd of this dispensation of our Saviour, as in like manner of his shewing himself more to the Apostles than to other believers (though even of these there were not a few to whom he shewed himself alive, for St. Paul tells us that

1 Cor. 15. 6. he was sometime seen <sup>1</sup> by *above five hundred brethren* at once;) But what hath been said is enough to shew, that, as there was a reason why he should use some reservedness in shewing himself after his resurrection, so he left not those, to whom he did not personally appear, without sufficient proof of it.

III. The truth of our Saviours resurrection being thus established, proceed we to enquire by whose power it was effected. Not that there is or can be any doubt of its having been effected by the power of God and the Father, because so often <sup>1</sup> attributed to him by the Scripture, but that question hath lately been made whether the Son of God had any interest in it, and with, and under the Father raised up himself. Though why any question should be made of that, I do not say only, considering that Godhead which we have shewn to be common to him with the Father, but considering what our Saviour hath, as to this particular, affirmed of himself, I must needs say I am not able to discern. For is it that he was without power to accomplish this so great a work, and was mortified in the *spirit* as well as in the *flesh*? But he himself affirmeth of himself <sup>1</sup>, that as he had *power to lay down his life*, so he had *power to take it again*; not indeed independently of the Father (for this <sup>2</sup> and all other privileges he *receiv'd* from him together with his Godhead) but that this power was really vested in him, and he might therefore make use of it if he pleas'd. Only because it may be said, or rather is, that it is also written, that to them that *believe* is also power given to *become the Sons of God*, and immortal, and so this power, whereof we speak, may be but common to him with other men; I think it but just to add, that, as even

Act. 2. 24.  
3. 15.  
5. 30.  
Gal. 1. 1.

Joh. 10. 18.

Ibid.

Increpat. Bar-  
Jesu Sect. 49.

Joh. 1. 13.

this power of believers, whatsoever it is, was given to them by *Christ* <sup>3</sup>, which will rather prove his ability to raise himself than overthrow it, so it was a power not to make themselves, but to be or to be *made* the Sons of God; the same St. John immediately affirming this generation to be made <sup>4</sup> *not by blood, or the will of the flesh or man, but by God*. Whereas on the contrary, it is affirmed concerning Christ, that he hath not only power to lay down his life, and receive it after it was given to him, but to take it *up* also from that place where he had deposited it. For neither otherwise could this *taking* whereof our Saviour speaks answer to that *laying down* to which it is oppos'd, nor yet contain any thing in it which should occasion his Auditours to affirm that he had a *devil*, and *was mad*, as we find by the sequel that it did. For what was there of strangeness in affirming, that if God were pleas'd to give him life again, he had power to receive it, neither could they any more obstruct the doing of it, than they could take away his life without the leave of the Almighty. Into such absurdities will men run themselves, rather than acknowledge in their Saviour any thing that may look like divine; rather than do that, they will bring him down to the pitch of ordinary men, and make him appear, not only as not really God, but no way singular. But it may be, that, though this great person was not without power to raise himself, yet he did

did not exert it, but left the accomplishment of that work to the sole power of God. But neither can we give way to such a surmise, after we find him affirming concerning the temple of his body, that *if they destroy'd it he himself in three days would raise it up*. For neither can we think that he meant any other by that raising than the reedification of it, or somewhat answerable thereto; nor, when he gave it to them as a *sign* of the divinity of his Commission, think he would be wanting to the doing of it, when they should dissolve it. For so he should have given them occasion to question the divinity thereof, because failing as to that, which he had offer'd them as an argument of it. And though *even this* may seem capable of an evasion, because this reedification may be suppos'd to have been effected, as the miracles of Christ's Disciples were, by the virtue of his prayers, or rather by God's accompanying his Prayers and endeavours with the concurrence of his Almighty power, and to which therefore it ought rather to be attributed than unto himself; Yet will that evasion be look'd upon as frivolous, if we consider what St. John, (who hath told us of the reedifying his body) hath before affirm'd concerning him. For however such a reedification as that might find some countenance, if there were no appearance at all of his being other than man, yet certainly not so, when he who thus affirms of himself, is declared by St. John in the very entrance of his gospel to be *God and with God, one by whom all things were made, and without whom nothing was made, that was made at all*: Such attributes as those, as they shew him not to have been without an inherent power to raise himself, so obliging us to believe, unless some cause could be alledg'd for the suspension of it, that he would not be wanting to exert it, to deliver himself from that inglorious estate in which he lay. For now the time of his exaltation was to begin, and wherein therefore it was reasonable enough to shew that divinity, which had been so long over-shadowed by the *infirmities* of his flesh.

IV. Being now, as you see, to enquire at what time our Saviour rose, because the *Creed*, as well as the *Scripture*, obligeth us to make it an Article of our belief, I think it but just to premise, that we are not only to consider it as to its distance from the time of his death, but also from the time of his burial. For though the former of these may seem only intended, because expressing this resurrection not by a resurrection *from the grave* but *from the dead*, yet is there reason enough to take the latter in, both in the *Creed* and in the *Scripture*. In the *Creed*, because not only premising his *burial* and *descent into hell* as well as his death, and with relation to which therefore this third days resurrection may be very well understood, but because the *Ancient* ones read only *Crucified and buried*, and to which therefore this *third days* resurrection may well be thought to have a more peculiar reference: Though if that sense be not thought so clear in the *Creed*, yet it is in the *Scripture*, by which even the *Creed* is to be interpreted: It being the Affirmation of our Saviour, not only that he should *rise again the third day from the dead*, but that as *Jonas was three days and three nights in the Whales belly*, so should *the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth*, Which last words as they do manifestly refer to our Saviours grave, and so make his third days resurrection to refer to that, as well as his foregoing death; so that resurrection therefore to be considered as such, if it were only the better to shew the correspondency it had with the Scriptures of the *Old Testament*, and particularly with the foregoing one of *Jonas*.

Which said, I will now set my self to shew, what yet will not be difficult to do, how this *third days* resurrection accords with the story of it in the gospel, as that again with the several expressions that are made use of, both by the Creed, and the Scripture, to describe it. For it appearing from the Scriptures that our Saviour died about the *ninth hour*<sup>a</sup> of the *friday*, that is to say about our three in the afternoon, and was buried before the expiration of that day; St. *Mark* expressly telling us, that that day was *the preparation*<sup>b</sup>, that is (as he himself interprets it) *the day before the sabbath*: And it appearing moreover from the same St. *Mark*<sup>c</sup> that he rose again *early the first day of the week*, or the day after the Sabbath, it will not be difficult to shew, what accordance there is between that account of his resurrection, and his being said to have risen the *third day*, as our *Creed* and several Scriptures express it, or *after three days*, as both St. *Mark*<sup>d</sup> and the *Jews* did<sup>e</sup>. For supposing the expression to be, that he rose *the third day*, as both the *Creed* and the *Scriptures* generally express it; so that expression will be reconcil'd with the former account, by reckoning that day as *one* on which he died and was buried, and that as *another* on which he rose: As we our selves are wont to reckon, when we call that a *tertian* Ague which happens every other day, so reckoning the day, on which we formerly had it, as the first, and that day, wherein it comes again, as the third. Again, supposing the expression to be that he rose *after three days*, as not only the *Jews* but St. *Mark* expressed it, so that may also be adjusted to the former account by reckoning by an usual *synecdoche* a part of a day for the whole. For so, though it will not be found to have hapned *after three days compleat*, yet *after*, as well as *upon* three *incomplete* ones. The only expression, in my opinion, that may seem to require our consideration (though being but a *singular* one it ought in reason to be interpreted by the story of the resurrection, and more *usual* ones) is our Saviours affirming as before, that as *Jonas was three days and three nights in the whales belly*, so should *the son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth*: There being no appearance at all of his lying, I do not say only, above *two whole nights* in the earth, but not so much as a *part* of a *third*. But as much of the harshness of that expression will be taken off by supposing a part of a day to be taken for the whole; so much more by considering, that the Jews, led thereunto by the computation of *Moses*<sup>f</sup>, were wont, and do still reckon their days from the evening of the precedent, to the evening of the following one. For by this means Christ may be affirmed to have lain *three nights* as well as *three days* in the bowels of the earth, because lying therein a part of that *friday* which they were wont to compute from the evening of the *thursday* preceding, and so including the night also in it. Thus much I thought good to offer as to the clearing of those expressions, which are wont to be made use of to denote the time of our Saviours rising: But as the main difficulty consists in reconciling what our Saviour spake by way of prediction concerning his resurrection, and the story of that resurrection as it is afterwards describ'd; so it is only upon the account of that predictions seeming to defer it for a longer time, than it appears by the event that it was. Which is a difference to the advantage of him by whom it was made, rather than to the prejudice either of him, or of his veracity. For that resurrection of his being predicted by him, either for a *sign* of the divinity of his mission, or to *comfort* his Disciples in the expectation of it, and so both for the securing of his own honour and the benefit

<sup>a</sup> Mat. 27. 46.  
<sup>8c.</sup>

<sup>b</sup> Marc. 15. 42.

<sup>c</sup> — 16. 9.

<sup>d</sup> Marc. 8. 31.

<sup>e</sup> Mat. 27. 63.

<sup>f</sup> Gen. 1. 5.  
 Lev. 23. 32.



benefit of the world; he must be thought to have answer'd it to good purpose who shall bring it about rather *before* than *upon* the time predicted by him: Partly, because by so hastning what he hath foretold he doth so much the sooner make way for the clearing of his own glory, and the comforting of the world, and partly because no man yet was ever accounted worse than his word who hasten'd to accomplish what he had promis'd, even before he gave men reason to expect it.

V. An account being thus given of the of truth our Saviour's resurrection and the time of it, which are the things that are especially here intended, it may be but time to enquire what agreement there is between what is here affirm'd, and the predictions of the Ancient Prophets. It being not to be thought but that if any such thing as a resurrection was intended by God of the Messiah, it would be carefully remarked there. That we may therefore come to understand whether or no, and how far this resurrection of our Saviour was foretold, we will first of all consider it *in it self*, and then as to that *point of time* wherein it is affirmed to be accomplished.

It is the affirmation of St. Pauls that as Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, so he rose again according to the same, and conformably to what they had foretold of him. Not unlike, we may well imagine, was the purport of Christ himself, when to those Disciples, who seemed to be astonished at his past death and that resurrection from it which began then to be related, he did not only say <sup>b</sup> *O fools* <sup>b</sup> Luc. 24. 25; *and slow of heart to believe all that the Prophets had spoken*, but moreover demanded of them, <sup>i</sup> *Ought not Christ* (for so he presently <sup>k</sup> interprets himself) *by the predictions of Moses and all the Prophets, to have suffered these things, and so enter into his glory.* For being there could be no entrance into glory after such sufferings, but by the intervention of a resurrection from that death which his sufferings had brought upon him; being the resurrection of Christ was one of those things at which they were so much *astonished*, and upon occasion of which he proceeds to chide them for *not believing* what the Prophets had spoken; it is but reasonable to suppose, that Moses and the Prophets had been no more sparing in setting down that than those sufferings and death which did precede it. If any thing hinder my discovery of their predictions, it must be my own dulness of understanding, which yet I will endeavour to quicken by a diligent and assiduous application of it.

To begin with that prophecy, which is the first we meet with concerning the *Messiah*, and where indeed there is no express mention either of his death or resurrection. And no wonder, when, as hath been elsewhere intimated, it was not till after many hundreds of years that that *Messiah* was to be exhibited, and therefore not so necessary to be particularized to the world. But as that *bruising of the heel*<sup>a</sup>, which he is <sup>Gen. 3. 15</sup> foretold to receive from the *Serpent*, doth plainly denote him to be a suffering person; so being but *in the heel* doth as clearly intimate, that it should either be no deadly one, or from which he should as truly recover, as though it had not: The former of which as it is not to be said, because it appears by the following prophecies that it should bring death upon him, so doth therefore oblige us to understand, that though this *bruise* should bring death, yet not such, but that he should at length recover from it, as well as if it had been a less deadly one.

From that first Prophecy pass we to another, for such I hope to prove

<sup>m</sup> Hosea 11. 1.  
<sup>vid.</sup> & Gal.  
 4. 22, 23, &c.  
<sup>n</sup> Heb. 11. 19.

it, though wrap'd up as other Prophecies<sup>m</sup> were in an *History*; That, I mean, which presents us with *Abraham's* offering up his Son and receiving him again alive from it: Not only the Author to the *Hebrews*<sup>n</sup> representing this as a *parable* or *image of a resurrection* from the dead, but the story it self so perswading; *Isaac* being so near to death by God's command and his Father's act, that his recovery from it may pass for no obscure image of a resurrection. But how to evince this to have been intended by God as such, yea as a prefignification of the resurrection of the *Messiah*, is not so easie, but however will be worth our while to enquire. For the resolution whereof I shall desire it may be considered, what hath

<sup>o</sup> Explication of  
 the word Dead.

<sup>p</sup> Isa. 53. 10.

elsewhere<sup>o</sup> been sufficiently cleared, that the sacrifices of the *Old Testament* were intended as a shadow of that better sacrifice, which the *Messiah*, by the confession of the same *Old Testament*<sup>p</sup>, was to make of himself for us. For that suppos'd, it will not be difficult to apprehend, that this intentional sacrifice of *Isaac* was also a type of it, nor yet, after that, *Isaac's* deliverance from it of the *Messiah's* resurrection from his. For first, this sacrifice of *Isaac* came yet more nearly to that of *Christ*, as being the sacrifice not of a beast, but of a man, yea a holy one. But so did it also do, in that it was the sacrifice of one who was not altogether unlike him even in his conception and birth. For though he was not conceiv'd of a Virgin, and without the intervention of a man, yet of persons that were naturally as unapt, the one by the course of nature being unapt to beget, the other as unapt to conceive. Which made the Mother of *Isaac* (as we learn from the story<sup>q</sup> of her) laugh at the promise of it; so little probability shall I say, or rather possibility was there humanely speaking of it. It will appear yet more manifest thirdly, if we consider this *Isaac* also as the intended Father of the *Messiah*, and in whom, through the means of that *Messiah*, all the nations of the earth should be blessed. For by how much the more near his relation and affinity was unto the *Messiah*, so much the more likelihood there was still of what was done unto *Isaac* being intended as a type and prefignification of him, to whom he did so relate, and with whom he did so symbolize. Which will consequently make it the more reasonable to believe the recovery of *Isaac* from death to have been intended as a type of *Christ's* resurrection from his; That, as it was no contemptible figure of a resurrection in it self, so promising rather more than less to him, who did so far surpass *Isaac* in his sacrifice, as actually to fall under that death, which the other did but offer himself unto.

<sup>q</sup> Gen. 18. 12.

We have seen what evidence there is in *Moses* of the resurrection of the *Messiah*, pass we therefore to the book of *Psalms*, and whose Author, living so much nearer to the time of his exhibition, may therefore be supposed to have had a more clear conception of it. And indeed we shall not need to advance far into that book, before we find a fair intimation of what we are desirous to demonstrate. For as the second of those *Psalms* is a noble Prophecy concerning the *Messiah*, even in the confession of the *Ancienter Jews*, so *St. Paul*<sup>r</sup> alledges, for the proof of his resurrection, that so well known passage of it, *Thou art my son<sup>s</sup>, this day have I begotten thee*. For though that passage is capable of a far higher sense, yea ought no doubt to have it, yet is there reason enough to believe, from the foregoing verses, that that also was intended by it. For giving us to understand that the *Kings of the earth should set themselves<sup>t</sup> and the rulers take counsel together against the Lord and against his a-*  
*nointed*

<sup>r</sup> Act. 13. 33.

<sup>s</sup> Psa. 2. 7.

<sup>t</sup> ——— 2.

ointed (which is by St. Peter <sup>a</sup> appli'd to what Herod and Pontius Pilate and the Jews did against our Saviour, and ought no less to be so appli'd by the Jews, when it appears by other scriptures of theirs that this *Messiah* was also to be put to death by them) it is but reasonable to believe, that when the Psalmist to the disappointing of those counsels urgeth God's giving this *Messiah* a new *begetting*, he should understand it from the womb of that earth, into which those violent counsels of theirs had brought him. Only if it should be objected, as perhaps it may, that he who tells us of those Princes counsels and enterprizes, doth withal assure us that they were *vain*, yea moreover that God would notwithstanding them, *set this King of his upon his holy hill of Sion*, which may seem to make those counsels ineffectual, as to the taking away his life; Beside that the contrary is evident from the Jews own Scriptures, and they therefore not to impose such a sense upon it, those counsels of theirs will be look'd upon as rendred sufficiently vain, because they did not hinder him from *reigning* over the world notwithstanding, but more especially from Gods restoring him to that life which they had taken from him, and so reviving both him and his Empire together. Which is the rather to be believ'd, because of those glorious things that follow presently after the mention of that *begetting*, and Gods giving him thereupon *the heathen for his inheritance*, and his exercising a *dreadful Authority* over such of them as should continue in their enmity. For if we compare Prophecy with Prophecy, as no doubt we ought, we shall find by the Prophet *Isay*, that those glorious effects were to follow upon and because of his *making his son an offering for sin*, yea *pouring out his soul unto death*. For then and therefore saith that great Prophet, *shall the pleasure of the Lord prosper in his hands*, and he accordingly both *see of the travel of his soul in the justification of many*, and, like a conqueror over his enemies, *divide the spoil with the great and mighty*.

Now though the texts, that have been already alledg'd, are fair intimations of that resurrection, which we are endeavouring to demonstrate out of the *Old Testament*, yet, if we look a little farther, we shall find more evident declarations of it, and such as it will be impossible to exclude. Of which nature I reckon the *sixteenth* Psalm of the same *David*, and which indeed is so clear, that it will suffice only to mention it. For as it appears from thence, that this *Messiah* was to descend both into *hell* and the place of *corruption* (for otherwise he could not have comforted himself with any reason in the hopes of *not being left* in the one or being freed from the *depredation* of the other) so it appears no less, that God would not permit him to be holden by either, but on the contrary bring him out of those *vallies of the shadow of death* into the *path of life*, yea (as I shall afterwards shew) of a more glorious life than that which he had deposited. And though I will not say there is so express proof of it in the *two and twentieth* Psalm of the same *David* where he doth particularly describe the sufferings of the *Messiah*, yet, as I have made it evident from thence that his following death is sufficiently intimated in it, so he is brought in after all declaring that he would *praise God in the midst of the congregation*, yea calling upon others to do so, so because of God's *kindness* to him, and instead of *despising and abhorring his affliction*, discovering his face to him and *hearing him*. Which how God could be suppos'd to do, or he triumph in, unless God had



had delivered him from death, will I suppose not be easie to conjecture.

I will conclude those Prophecies, which respect the resurrection of the *Messiah* simply and absolutely considered, when I have taken notice of the *fifty third chapter* of *Isay*, where there is so clear a mention of his foregoing death and burial. For besides the evidence there is of it in those signal words of his, which I have before explain'd, even that *He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living, for the transgression of my people was he stricken;* It is afterwards yet more clearly affirm'd <sup>h</sup>, that when God should make *his soul an offering for sin, he should prolong his days, he should see his seed, and the pleasure of the Lord prosper in his hands:* The former of these three importing the restoring of him to a durable life, the two latter not to be accomplished without a restitution to one.

But because it appears from *St. Paul* <sup>i</sup> that *Christ's third day's* resurrection was according to the Scriptures, as well as that resurrection it self, and our Saviour <sup>k</sup>, who undoubtedly knew it much better, doth not obscurely insinuate it; therefore it will be but just to enquire also what evidence there is of that, and particularly, what reason we have, beside the allegation of our Saviour, to induce us to believe, that the instance of *Jonas* had a respect unto it. In order whereunto I will consider this circumstance of our Saviour's resurrection, as to *Moses* and the *Psalms* and the *Prophets*, which is a division that the *New Testament*, or rather the *Author* of it doth somewhere <sup>l</sup> make of the *Old*. I alledge for *Moses* and his writings, the account he gives of the intentional sacrifice of *Isaac*, and of his miraculous deliverance from it. For that, as was before shewn, being a *figure of a resurrection*, and, which is more, intended by God as a figure of that of our Saviour, may also, if it contain any thing of that nature, be presum'd to be as well a figure of his rising the *third day*, as of that rising it self. Which that it doth, his being delivered by God the *third day* <sup>m</sup> after he was condemned to death, may serve for a sufficient evidence. For that Sacrifice of his being principally made up by the command of God, and the resolution of *Abraham* to make such an offering of him as was requir'd, he must be concluded to have been so long a dead man as he continued thus devoted by God and *Abraham* to it; and accordingly, because it was three days that he continued thus devoted, not to have had his resurrection till after that time was expired. Which will consequently make the resurrection of *Isaac* to have been a type of that of our Saviour as to the time wherein it hapned, as well as of that resurrection it self.

To the light which the writings of *Moses* afford us subjoin we that which shines in the *Psalms* of *David*, and particularly in that <sup>n</sup>, which we have said to be the most clear proof of *Christ's* resurrection from the dead. Not that it is also as clear for the time wherein it is affirmed to have hapned, but that it sufficiently insinuates that it should not be long after his death, and with great probability also, that it should be within that time wherein it is said to have been accomplished. Because not only affirming, that God would not leave his soul in hell, but that he would not suffer <sup>o</sup> either *that* to continue there or his *flesh* in the grave, till it came to see corruption. For being the body doth begin to see corruption about the third day (as both *Martha's* telling our Saviour concerning

*Lazarus,*

<sup>i</sup> Isa. 53. 8.

<sup>h</sup> — 10.

<sup>i</sup> 1 Cor. 15. 4.

<sup>k</sup> Mat. 12. 40.

<sup>l</sup> Luc. 24. 44.

<sup>m</sup> Gen. 22. 4.

<sup>n</sup> Psa. 16. 10.

<sup>o</sup> Ibid.

Lazarus, who had now been dead four daies<sup>s</sup>, that by that time he<sup>s</sup> <sup>Joh. 11. 39.</sup> stank, and the Ancients celebrating the memories of the deceased upon the third day<sup>s</sup>, because then the countenance of the deceased changeth, shew; ) It is therefore but reasonable to believe, that our Saviour should rise within that time, because, by the force of the former Prophecy, not to see any thing of that nature. Only if it should be repl'd; that nothing hinders us to understand the Psalmist of Gods preserving him from corruption, and so his *not seeing corruption* need not denote the time wherein that resurrection should be accomplished; It may suffice to make answer, that neither is there any thing to hinder our understanding Gods delivering him from the grave before the usual time of corruption comes, but rather to perswade and enforce it: Because the *Messiah* is there brought in comforting himself with the hopes of Gods *not leaving him* in the state of the dead, with which a sudden deliverance from death doth more correspond, than any assurance, how great soever, of being miraculously freed from corruption, doth.

After the *Psalms* follow the *Prophets* both in the account of our Saviour, and in the order of our discourse. Where first I cannot but take notice, because I find the *Ancients*<sup>s</sup> doing so, of those signal words of the Prophet *Hosea*<sup>s</sup>, *After two days he will revive us, in the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight.* For though I deny not but that these words had a *first* sense in those to whom they were directed, and accordingly imported Gods sudden restauration of them upon their repentance; yet when the words are in themselves so expressive of a resurrection, that they are by the *Chaldee Paraphrase* applied to that consolation which men shall receive at and by the resurrection of the dead; when they do moreover so symbolize with that *third day's* one of our Saviour, and, as *Ruffinus*<sup>s</sup> hath observed, with the resurrection of those Saints that rose together with him, I cannot but wonder to see, that they should not pass for a sufficient indication of it: Especially when, as *Munster*<sup>u</sup> observes, this very Prophecy is by the Jews referr'd to the *Messiah's* delivering them from that captivity under which they now are. For what greater proof can we well desire of this Prophecies relating to the resurrection of our *Messiah*, when it doth not only so exactly accord with the story of it, but is by the Ancient Christians applied to this affair, as that application so far own'd by the Jews, that it is even by them acknowledged to refer to that *Messiah* who was foretold? Though if this Prophecy will not down with our Christian *Rabbins*, as hardly will they allow of any which their Jewish Masters do not also give their suffrage to; It is to be hoped, for the respect they bear unto our Saviour, that the story of *Jonas* will: Our Saviour not only resembling his own resurrection to it, but giving it the very name of *the sign of the Prophet Jonas*. Only to let men farther see, that it was not without cause, that our Saviour referr'd to this as a typical prediction of his resurrection, I will point out some not contemptible reasons; to evince it to have been such as it was represented by our Saviour. And here not to insist, because our Saviour<sup>s</sup> hath sufficiently done it, upon<sup>s</sup> <sup>Mat. 12. 40.</sup> the accord there is between *Jonas's* continuing *three days and three nights in the belly of the whale* (that *sheol*<sup>s</sup> and pit of *corruption*<sup>s</sup> as *Jonas*<sup>s</sup> <sup>Joh. 2. 2:</sup> no less significantly than prophetically stiles it) and our Saviour's as long continuing *in the heart of the earth*; I shall desire it may be first considered, what analogy there was between the persons to whom both the one and the other Prophet were sent, and, as I shall afterwards shew, for

<sup>s</sup> Mewf. Glos.  
Græco-Barb. in  
Verbo τριτῆς  
νύκτας.

<sup>s</sup> Tert. adv.  
Marcion. li. 4.  
c. 43. Item  
Ruffin. Exposit.  
in symbol.  
<sup>s</sup> Hof. 6. 2.

<sup>s</sup> Ruffin. ubi  
supra.

<sup>s</sup> Annot. in loc.

for whose sake these two great signs were intended. For was it *an evil and adulterous generation*<sup>a</sup>, which our Saviour was to convince, and to bring to repentance and amendment? The men of *Nineveh* were not much better (for *their wickedness* is said <sup>b</sup> to have *come up before God*) that I say not, that they were tainted with the same impurities, which our Saviour there chargeth upon the Jews. It being not at all improbable, that so great and rich a City as *Nineveh* was given over, among other vices, to luxury, and those impurities that do usually follow upon it. Again, was *Jonah* a preacher of *repentance*, whether directly or indirectly matters not? for he who gives notice before-hand of an approaching ruine, may be presum'd to be sent by God to take men off from their sins, as without which design it is not at all likely he would have given notice of it. Our Saviour was a preacher of *repentance* before his resurrection and afterwards; yea that very sign wherein he conform'd to *Jonas* was an intimation of that design. For however God might before *wink at the ignorance* as well as wickedness of the world, yet now <sup>c</sup> as *St. Paul* speaks, *he commands all men every where to repent. Because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordain'd, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath rais'd him from the dead.* And though it doth not appear from the story of *Jonah*, how his being swallowed by a Whale, and afterwards vomited up again could come to be notified to the *Ninevites*, and so prove a *sign* to them of the divinity of his message; yet as it is not to be suppos'd, that *Jonah* could, among persons perfectly strangers unto God, procure to himself the credit of a Prophet, without the seal of a miracle to confirm it, so we learn from *St. Luke*<sup>d</sup> that *Jonas became a sign unto the Ninevites*, by virtue of that deliverance which he had from the belly of the whale, this as appears by *St. Matthew*<sup>e</sup> being *the sign of the Prophet Jonas*, and which therefore we are to suppose to have been some way or other notified to them. And possibly God, who meant not that so signal a work of his should be lost, took care that there should be some eye-witnesses of that deliverance of his from the belly of the Whale, and who confirm'd it to those *Ninevites* whom he was sent again to admonish. In this particular yet more conformably to that better miracle which it was to adumbrate; Our Saviours resurrection being, though manifested to the world, yet not immediately, but by the mediation of certain persons, whom he appointed as witnesses of his several appearances. Lastly, was our Saviour not without strong and comfortable assurances, of *not being left in hell*, neither suffered to *see corruption* in his flesh? We do not only find *Jonah* to have attain'd such a deliverance, but that he was not, even in the belly of the whale, without the same assurances; The Scripture giving us to understand, that he did even *there* affirm that *God had heard him*<sup>f</sup> *when he cried out of the belly of hell*, yea that *God had brought up his life*<sup>g</sup> *from corruption*. Such reason is there to believe, that as there was no small cognation between *Jonah's* resurrection and that of *Christ*, so the one was intended as a type and prefiguration of the other. And then there will be as little reason to doubt, because that is particularly affirmed<sup>h</sup> concerning *Jonah's* continuing in the belly of the Whale, that his being *there* three days and three nights, and afterwards vomited up again alive, was intended as a type of *Christ's* quitting the grave and hell, after he had for so long time continued in the tenure of them.

<sup>a</sup> Mat. 12. 39.<sup>b</sup> Jon. 1. 2.<sup>c</sup> Act. 17. 30.  
<sup>3h</sup><sup>d</sup> Luc. 11. 29.<sup>e</sup> Mat. 12. 40.<sup>f</sup> Jon. 2. 2.  
<sup>g</sup> — 6.<sup>h</sup> — 1. 17.



VI. The sixth and last thing comes now to be enquir'd into, even the ends of our Saviours resurrection from the dead. For my more advantageous discovery whereof, I will consider this resurrection of his with reference to *himself*; and then with reference unto *us*. In respect of *him* there is no doubt it was intended as a reward of his past travels, or rather as a passage to that reward: Not only those texts of Scripture so perswading, which assure us, that, *because he had humbled himself unto the death of the cross*, therefore <sup>1</sup> God also did highly exalt him, but the meritoriousness of those travels of his, and which it is not to be suppos'd that the just and good God could ever suffer to be so ill requir'd, as to permit him to continue under a never-ending death. For if the distribution of rewards and punishments be a part of justice, yea of the divine one (as God doth frequently recommend his justice to us, by his *giving to every man according to his works*) it must be thought so, to reward so excellent a person, as our Saviour was, at least as far as a deliverance of him from death. For how shall we believe him to be just, who shall not deign to consider one, who, out of zeal to God's glory and the good of Souls, shall not only descend from his own glory, but humble himself even unto death for it? Not to say, that God had also made him a promise that he should be in a capacity to see <sup>2</sup> *of the travel of his soul*, and therefore also that it was neither just nor possible even in that respect to hold him under the power of that death, which would have kept him from ever seeing of it. From our Saviour's resurrection therefore, considered as to *himself*; pass we to consider it with reference to *our selves*, where we shall discern if not the like just, yet the like gracious ends. Witness first, the pattern he thereby set us to *rise* from sin to *newness of life*, as St. Paul <sup>3</sup> doth at large exemplifie it. For well may we think that to have been one end of our Saviour's resurrection, when we do not only find it affirm'd as to his death, which may seem to have had a far less regard to our instruction, that he thereby *left us an example* <sup>4</sup> *that we should follow his steps*, but our selves moreover called upon so to imitate him in his resurrection, yea said to have been therefore *buried with him by baptism into death* that we might *rise up* in like manner with him. And though after the many miracles our Saviour wrought when he was alive; there may seem to need no other evidence of the divinity of his doctrine and mission; yet as God had a design to overcome the obstinacy of the world by the exuberance of his kindness, and so cut off from sinful men all occasion to stand out against him and his Anointed, so it is manifest from our Saviour <sup>5</sup> himself that God intended this resurrection of his *secondly*, as a farther testimony to the divinity of his doctrine, and as a *sign* of his owning and acknowledging him. As how could the world think otherwise, when, contrary to the usual course of nature, and the methods of his providence, they saw him delivering him from that death, into which their maliciousness had cast him? But of all the ends which were intended in that resurrection of Christ, which is the subject of our present consideration, there is none more worthy of our regard (because none either more gracious in it self, or more particularly expressed) than his rising to procure the *justification* of us. For St. Paul not contented to say, that he was *raised again for our justification* <sup>6</sup> as well as that he was *delivered for our offences*, which yet is express enough for making that to have been one end of our Saviour's resurrection; When he comes to challenge any man to defeat the justification of God's elect, he doth thus express himself,

<sup>1</sup> Phil. 2. 8, 9.

<sup>2</sup> Isa. 53. 11.

<sup>3</sup> Rom. 6. 4. & c.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Pet. 2. 21.

<sup>5</sup> Mat. 12. 39.

<sup>6</sup> Rom. 4. 25.

<sup>1</sup> Rom. 8. 33, *Who shall lay any thing<sup>p</sup> to the charge of God's elect? It is God that*

34-

*justifieth: Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again.* Thereby making the justification of a Christian to depend *more* upon Christ's resurrection than death, upon his being *raised again* for us, than upon his being *delivered for our offences*: As in this respect it must be confessed to do, because, though the sufferings and death of Christ be that *whereby we are to be justified*, yet his resurrection and the consequents thereof are *that which must give us an interest* in those his sufferings and death, and so procure our actual justification by them. For inasmuch as Christ's death is not actually imputed where *faith* is not, and the Holy Ghost, by which faith is begotten in us, was not to be sent till Jesus was *glorified*; if Christ had not risen from the dead, the merits of his death had not been ours, nor we justified from our sins by them. I may not dismiss this Article of our Saviour's *resurrection* and the *ends* of it, till I have also admonished, that this resurrection was intended to make way for *ours*, and so tend yet more to the justification of us, because to our deliverance from that death under which our sins had brought us. Not but that there was merit enough in Christ's satisfaction and death, to procure this *justification also*; but that, it being in the power of God to set such reasonable bounds to his own acceptance of it, as he in his infinite wisdom should think fit, it was his pleasure, that this head and surety of ours should, for the attaining of his purposes, over-

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. 15. 20,  
23-

come death for us as well as taste of it, and become *the first-fruits<sup>9</sup> of them that slept*, as well as make an *offering of himself* for us. As well might he require that also of our redeemer and surety, when it did not only tend so much the more to the illustration of his own glory, because making that very nature which had been foil'd by death, the immediate instrument of our recovery from it and him that had *the power* of it, but to the farther glory of our redeemer, because still more a *Saviour* of us. However as no doubt can be made of his rising to procure ours, who is represented as *the first-fruits of<sup>1</sup> them that slept*, and not only so, but as *that Adam* in whom we were to be *made alive<sup>1</sup>*, as we had been before destroy'd by that *first and worse* one; so nothing hinders us to cry out, even upon the single account of that resurrection of his, *O death where is thy sting? O grave, or rather hell, where is thy victory* even over us sinful men? For so assured is our resurrection in his, that it may seem already accomplished, and, according to some men's<sup>2</sup> interpretation of the forequoted Prophecy of *Hosea<sup>2</sup>*, we our selves *after two days revived* together with him, and on the *third day made to live in his sight*.

<sup>1</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. 15. 22.

55-

<sup>2</sup> Tertul. adv.

Marcion. l. 4.

c. 43.

<sup>2</sup> Hosea 6. 2.

he

# He ascended into Heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty.

## The Contents.

*What evidence we have of Christ's Ascent into Heaven, and what Heaven that was to which he did Ascend. That this Ascent of Christ was foretold in the Old Testament, and particularly Psalm the sixty eighth and the eighteenth, which is shewn at large to have been intended of the Messiah and his Ascent. An enquiry into the ends of Christ's Ascent into Heaven, whether in respect of us or of himself. In the former of which regards, it is shewn to have been, to procure for us some farther emoluments from God, and to conform us to the example of it: In the latter to procure to himself the reward of his past travels, and particularly an Advancement to the right hand of God. Occasion from thence taken to enquire into the sense of Christ's sitting on the right hand of God, which is shewn at large to signifie his being really seated on the right hand of the Throne of God, and both shining brightly there, and commanding from thence. What evidence there is in the Old Testament of this Session and the consequents thereof, and what proofs Christ hath given of this his advancement and Sovereignty.*

**O**UR Saviour, having now by the space of *fourty days* convers'd <sup>He</sup> ascend- with his Disciples on earth, and thereby both confirm'd them in <sup>ed</sup> into the truth of his Resurrection, and given them a more perfect in- <sup>Heaven,</sup> formation concerning himself and doctrine, began to bethink himself of <sup>and</sup> ascending to that joy and glory, for the sake <sup>a</sup> of which he had suffered <sup>teth</sup> on the so much from the hands both of God and men. Only that his Disciples <sup>right</sup> might partake in some measure with him of his glorious *Ascent*, or at least <sup>band</sup> of be thereby the more confirm'd in the expectation of their own, he <sup>God the</sup> thought it but requisite to make them eye-witnesses of *his*, and so add <sup>Farther</sup> that testimony to those many others he had given them of his *entring* <sup>mighty.</sup> <sup>b</sup> *into his glory*. Knowing therefore that the *eleven*<sup>c</sup>, and several others, <sup>Heb. 12. 2;</sup> with them, were gathered together in *Jerusalem*, he presented himself <sup>Luc. 24. 26.</sup> <sup>—33.</sup> <sup>—36.</sup> <sup>—38. &c.</sup> <sup>d</sup> this last time among them; and after his usual benediction and the up- <sup>a</sup> braiding of that infidelity <sup>e</sup> which as yet remained in them, but which he took care however to rectifie, he both admonish'd them of that service which he expected from them (even the preaching of his gospel to the world) and of that assistance he intended to vouchsafe them in it by the



collation of his Spirit. And with these and the like discourses, together with a command not to remove from *Jerusalem* <sup>f</sup> till they came to be thus assisted, he entertain'd them both in the City and as they pass'd **From** thence to Mount *Olivet* <sup>g</sup> on which hill part of *Bethany* <sup>h</sup> stood. Whither being now brought by him, and seated advantageously enough to behold his departing from them, after a solemn benediction of them, yea *amidst* the bestowing of it <sup>i</sup> he was in their <sup>k</sup> view *taken up from them*: Not (for ought appears either from the Gospel, or his own need

<sup>1</sup> of it) by a *whirlwind and a fiery chariot and horses* (as *Elijah* sometime <sup>m</sup> was) but by the agility which his body had now acquir'd, and the assistance that was lent to it by his Divinity. And thus *ascending* he was seen by those that were with him upon Mount *Olivet*, till a *cloud* <sup>n</sup> interpos'd, and so hindred them from following him any farther with their eyes. Only, lest there should have been any doubt (as there sometimes was concerning <sup>o</sup> *Elijah*) of his being taken into Heaven, yea into that Heaven where God doth more especially display his glory, care was taken *first*, that *two Angels* <sup>p</sup> should inform his Disciples, and in them us, that he was *taken up into heaven* as well as that

<sup>q</sup> he should *come down from thence* in the same manner wherein he ascended: As *after that* again by the *Lord* himself, that they should have a more sensible proof of it in those miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost, which he did not long after confer upon them. For these being manifestly in the alone power of the Father to bestow, and by our Saviour himself annexed to his own *going to* <sup>r</sup> and *praying* <sup>s</sup> the father for them; the collation of them is a certain proof of his having ascended unto him, and to that Heaven wherein he did especially reside. Whence it was (and certainly not without reason) that these Disciples of our Lord have affirmed him to have ascended up *far above* <sup>t</sup> *all heavens* (lest any one should think him to have been held in some of the inferior ones) to have *enter'd into heaven* to appear <sup>u</sup> *in the presence of God for us*, yea to have seated himself *on the right hand* <sup>v</sup> *of the Majesty on high*. Though if infidelity (for nothing below that can) desire a farther proof of Christ's *ascending into heaven*, yea that heaven which is the throne of God's glory, our Saviour himself will satisfy it, because shewing himself to *St. Stephen* <sup>x</sup>, immediately before his martyrdom, in that heaven where the *glory of God* resides, and *standing at the right hand* of him and it.

The truth of the present Article being thus secur'd, or at least of the former part thereof, enquire we what indications there were of the matter of it in the *Prophecies of the Old Testament*, and for what *ends* it was that he did thus ascend.

I. And here to borrow as little as may be from the labours of other men, but however not to borrow from any, whom I may not be able to pay by giving some further light to those texts that are alledged by them, I will first of all produce that passage of the *Psalmist* <sup>y</sup> which is by *St. Paul* himself appli'd <sup>z</sup> to the business of our Saviour's Ascent, and after which therefore we cannot doubt of its being a *Prophecy* concerning it. *Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive, thou hast received gifts for men, yea for the rebellious also that the Lord God might dwell among them.* Now there are two things which it will be requisite to shew, in order to the establishing of the present

Prophecy,

<sup>f</sup> — 49.

<sup>g</sup> Act. 1. 12.

<sup>h</sup> Luc. 24. 50.

<sup>i</sup> — 51.

<sup>k</sup> Act. 1. 9.

<sup>1</sup> Arnald. *Albis Boneval. de Cardinal. Christi Operibus.* Serm. de Ascens. Christi. *Elevatis igitur manibus, hereditariam benedictionem relinquens, non manus factio vehiculo, nec auxiliaribus carpentis evectus est Christus, sed natura divina propria usque virtute, carnem caelo intulit, & corpus glorificatum patris conspectibus presentavit. Non indignit vel gloribus Angelis, qui offendicula tollentes à medio servant eum; sed praecedentes & subsequentes applaudebant victori, &c.*

<sup>m</sup> 2 Kings 2. 11.

<sup>n</sup> Act. 1. 9.

<sup>o</sup> 2 Kings 2. 16.

<sup>p</sup> Act. 1. 10, 11.

<sup>q</sup> Joh. 16. 7.

<sup>r</sup> — 14. 16.

<sup>s</sup> Eph. 4. 10.

<sup>t</sup> Heb. 9. 24.

<sup>u</sup> — 1. 3.

<sup>x</sup> Act. 7. 55.

<sup>y</sup> Psa. 68. 18.

<sup>z</sup> Eph. 4. 8.

Prophecy, first that by *ascending on high* is meant *ascending into heaven*, and secondly that this was meant of the *Messiah*. I alledge for the former of these, not only the *Chaldee Paraphrast* interpreting this *Ascending on high* of *ascending the firmament* (which yet is enough to enervate his application of it to *Moses*, who never ascended thither) and the propriety of that phrase to expresse such an Ascent whereof we speak; but also, yea chiefly the reason that *Paraphrast's* and *St. Paul's* application of it gives us, to understand it of an *Ascent into heaven* as well as of the *Ark of God's* ascending<sup>a</sup> unto Mount *Sion*, which, I no way doubt, was first intended in it. For it being a thing confess'd that many places of Scripture had both a lower and a higher sense, in the former whereof they referr'd to something either already acted or shortly to be so, as in the latter to somewhat more remote, and particularly to the dayes of the *Messiah*; And it appearing farther, as to this particular place, both by the *Chaldee Paraphrast's* and *St. Paul's* application of it; that this passage was one of that nature, and referr'd as well to an *Ascent into heaven* as to that of Mount *Sion* whither the *ark of God* was at length carried; What pretence can there remain for the not understanding it of such an Ascent as both *St. Paul* and the *Creed* assert? For neither can we suppose that *St. Paul* would so confidently have alledg'd it to prove *Christ's* Ascent into Heaven, unless it had been a thing then known and confess'd that an Ascent into Heaven was at least connoted in it; and much less doubt of that interpretation of his, when we find the *Jews own Chaldee Paraphrast* so interpreting it, even when he attributes it to him, to whom such an ascent could not properly appertain. If there be any thing to take off from our application, it must be that there is no appearance of its belonging to that *Messiah* to whom it is referr'd by us. But as to be sure there is no appearance of its belonging to him to whom the *Chaldee Paraphrast* applies it, save the mention there is in the verse before of Mount *Sinai*, which is a very slender ground to build that interpretation on; so no man that considers the series of this *Psalms*, but must see plainly enough that it is an address of the *Psalmist* to the *Lord*, as the whole Psalm upon the matter is. Which though it will not immediately infer the understanding of the *Messiah*, because it may well refer to that *Lord* from whom the *Messiah* came, yet may help in some measure toward the proof of it: Because it is certain that this *Messiah* had also the title of *Lord*<sup>b</sup>; and was, even before his incarnation, an administrator of the government of the world<sup>c</sup> under him. But then, if we moreover consider what is affirmed of this *Lord* beside his *ascending up on high*, so we shall find yet more reason to establish us in that sense, which is by *St. Paul* and the *Christian Church* after him impos'd upon it. For is it not also said that he *receiv'd gifts for men* upon this his Ascent, and as both an attendant and reward of his precedent victory? And can that with any reason be affirmed of God the Father who receives nothing from any? Nay ought we not therefore to understand it of him, who, though he be also the *Lord*, yet is affirmed to have receiv'd even his<sup>d</sup> *being* from the other? Is it not farther affirm'd, that he *receiv'd gifts even for the rebellious*, and by which the *Lord God* might be induced to dwell among them? And can such gifts as those proceed from any other than the Father? or, that being granted, be any doubt of his receiving them, concerning whom it is affirm'd that he should be a *light of the Gentiles*<sup>e</sup> (and to whom the title of rebellious doth more peculiarly belong) yea that

<sup>a</sup> Pla. 68. 1. 16.  
comp. with  
Num. 10. 35.

<sup>b</sup> Jer. 23. 6.

<sup>c</sup> See Explic. of  
the words Our  
Lord.

<sup>d</sup> Pla. 2. 7.

<sup>e</sup> Isa. 42. 6.  
—49. 6.

<sup>1</sup> Psa. 2. 8.

that he should have those Gentiles for his inheritance<sup>1</sup>, and the utmost parts of the earth for his possession: That being not to be effected without subjecting them in a great measure to his commands, as neither this but by the assistance of that Spirit of God which we find to have been first poured out upon himself. One only thing there is, in which this passage of the *Psalmist* may seem to be deficient, I mean that it takes no notice of any foregoing descent, and particularly into the *grave* and *Hades*, with relation to which this Ascent of Christ is manifestly to be understood. But as for that reason I shall alledge other places of the *Old Testament* by which that supposed defect may be suppli'd, so it will not be hard for an attentive Reader to discern some indications of it here. For supposing (as we have before shewn) that he, who is here affirmed to *ascend on high*, is also the *Lord*, and we must suppose in like manner, because Heaven is the original seat of his glory, that before he could *ascend on high*, he must first (as *St. Paul* argues) *descend into the lower parts of the earth*, as without which he could not be said so to ascend.

<sup>2</sup> Eph. 4. 9.

From that first place of the *Psalmist* pass we to another, and so much the rather because it makes express mention of his descending to the *grave* and *hell*, upon and after which this Ascent of Christ is affirmed to have hapned: That I mean which affirms that *his soul* should *not be left in hell*<sup>2</sup>, *neither his flesh see corruption*.

<sup>3</sup> Psa. 16. 10.

For as those words are a sufficient indication of his having been before in the *grave* and *hell*, and not only so, but of his *resurrection* from them; So, to let us see what should happen to him thereupon, the *Psalmist* doth not only add that

<sup>4</sup> ——— 11.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

God would *shew him the path*<sup>4</sup> of life (which is a yet farther indication of his resurrection) but that<sup>5</sup> *in his presence is fulness of joy and at his right hand there are pleasures for evermore*. Which what is it but to say, that after his living again he should pass to God's presence and right hand, and there enjoy perfect bliss and joy? Otherwise what connexion can there be suppos'd to be between Gods promise of *shewing him the path of life* and the mention that afterwards follows of the both *joy* and *pleasures of Gods presence and right hand*? Or what satisfaction to the *Messiah* in contemplation of them, upon and after his deliverance from the *grave* and *hell*? No one being likely to be advantag'd by those either *joys* or *pleasures* which he shall not be admitted to enjoy. Con-

<sup>6</sup> ἡ ἀρεὴ σου με  
ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ σου  
μετὰ τῆς πρὸς  
σου πύξης σου.

<sup>7</sup> Ostendes mi-  
hi viam tuam  
vitae, & satia-  
bor jucunditate  
vultus tui, &  
suavitate victo-  
riae dexterae tuae

formable hereto is the *Septuagint* Version of this place<sup>6</sup> which here as well as elsewhere makes the sense of the *Hebrew* more clear and full; That, instead of those words of the *Hebrew*, *in thy presence is fulness of joy*, reading, *thou shalt fill me with joy by thy countenance*. But the *Syriack* version yet more agreeable<sup>7</sup>, *Thou shalt shew me the way of life, and I shall be satisfied with the pleasure of thy countenance, and with the sweetness of the victory of thy right hand*: Both the one and the other version importing the *Messiah's* enjoyment of Gods presence and right hand, and therefore also that he should be advanced to the place of them.

I may not omit that Prophecy of *Isay* so often made use of, though there be no express mention there of his Ascending into Heaven. For as it is evident from thence<sup>8</sup> that upon and by occasion of his passion he should be both restor'd to life, and advanced to great dignity and triumph, so those words of the Prophet<sup>9</sup> that he should be *exalted and extolled and be very high*, cannot well be thought to mean less than an advancement unto Heaven: Not only the many words that are made use

<sup>8</sup> Isa. 53. 10, &c.

<sup>9</sup> ——— 52. 13.

of



of to denote his exaltation so perswading, but also the interpretations of the Jews; It being the affirmation of *Rabbi Alschech*<sup>p</sup>, where he descants<sup>p</sup> upon those words, that he should be *lifted up above all the inferior worlds*, yea that he should live and act prosperously in *the highest world before God*, and, *like a Son*, yea *an only beloved one*, *delight himself before his maker*. So applying to *him*, and the exaltation here spoken of, that very passage which is made use of by *Solomon*<sup>q</sup> to express his nearness unto God at and before the Creation of the world.

<sup>p</sup> Vid. Hulf. Theolog. Jud. li. 1. parte 2. p. 321.

<sup>q</sup> Pro. 8. 30.

II. It appearing from the premises, that it is not without Authority from the *Old Testament*, that Christianity attributes to its *Messiah* an *Ascent into heaven*, proceed we to enquire into the *ends* of that Ascent, and so much the rather, because it will lead us to the consideration of his *sitting on the right hand of God*, the second thing affirmed in this Article. Where first I will consider this Ascent of our Saviour with relation to us and then with reference to himself.

Now there are two things again which were the design of this Ascent considered with relation unto us, to wit the procuring from God some farther emolument unto us, and conforming us to his own most blessed example.

In the number of the former of these I reckon,

1. First the procuring the descent of the *Holy Ghost* upon the Apostles, partly to lead them *into all truth*, but more especially to enable them<sup>r</sup> to enlighten and convert the world: This as it is assign'd by our Saviour himself<sup>r</sup> as one *end* of his Ascent, so represented by him also as so much depending upon it, that the Holy Ghost could not *otherwise*<sup>u</sup> be procur'd. Whether it were that it had been so of old determined by the Father, and after which therefore, considering the immutability of the divine decrees, there remain'd no other way of obtaining it; Or whether it were also (which may give us some light into the reason of that determination) to make it the more evident to the world, that they ow'd this so great a benefit to his now advanced Son. For had this gift been conferr'd before, they might perhaps have ascribed it to the Father, but hardly, if at all, to him, who had paid a price for it, and now solicited the Father for it. But when the collation of the *Holy Ghost* was deferr'd till after his Ascent, and (which is more) promis'd by himself to be sent by him not long after it; there could then be no farther doubt, that *Christ*, as *St. Peter*<sup>x</sup> speaks, *being exalted by the right hand of God* (or, as I should rather render those words *to or at it*) had *shed forth* that so signal a blessing upon them: It being not to be thought, that God would have given way to *his* Ascent, who should have arrogated to himself thereupon those gifts and graces, which appertain'd not unto him to bestow.

<sup>r</sup> Joh. 16. 13.

<sup>s</sup> Luc. 24. 47.

<sup>u</sup> Joh. 16. 7. <sup>v</sup> Ibid.

<sup>x</sup> Act. 2. 33.

2. The second *end* of our Saviour's Ascent, considered with relation to us, was, as he himself also tells us, *to prepare a place for his Disciples*. For *in my Father's house*, saith he<sup>y</sup>, *are many mansions*; *if it were not so I would have told you, I go to prepare a place for you*. The only thing of difficulty is, what is meant by this *preparation*, and so much the rather, because those places may seem to have been prepar'd before-hand, and so represented by him who promised the preparation of them: There being not (as *Tertullian*<sup>z</sup> hath observ'd) a more apt interpretation of those *many mansions* whereof our Saviour speaks, than that there are mansions of different sorts suitable to the demerits of those that are to be plac'd

<sup>y</sup> Joh. 14. 2.

<sup>z</sup> Scorpiace cap.

<sup>1</sup> 6. Aut quomodo

multae mansio-

nes apud Pa-

trē si non pro

varietate meri-

torum? quomodo

do & stella &

stella distabit in

gloria, nisi pro

diversitate ra-

plac'd

plac'd in them, and accordingly provided of different sorts of furnitures. There are who have thought that by the *preparing* of those places is meant no other than the preparing us for them by those graces which he should confer upon his going thither. But they must offer manifest violence to the Scripture, who can impose such interpretations on it, and convert the *preparing a place for us* into the *preparing of us for it*. It seems to me much more agreeable to the text, and to the custom of Harbingers (to which, as *Grotius*<sup>a</sup> observes, our Saviour doth manifestly allude) to make the meaning thereof to be, that he would go before-hand to the great Lord of heaven, to article with him for the receiving of his followers, and not only so, but to take order for the assigning of particular mansions, agreeably, either to his own good will and pleasure (for nothing hinders us to allow *that* also<sup>b</sup> a place in the distribution) or to the respective demerits of those who were to be lodged in them. The former whereof he did, by making God a tender of that blood which he had but lately shed for them; as the latter by representing his own great merits toward the father, and the piety of those for whom he did so interpose. For though those many mansions whereof our Saviour spake were not altogether unprepared, as which were not likely to be unprovided considering their being a part of that great house wherein God was pleas'd more especially to manifest his own glory; Yet the principal furniture thereof (if I may have leave so to speak) depended upon the manifestation of his glory, as that again upon the will of him who was to manifest it. Which *will* therefore that he might make propitious to us, and so induce him, when time came, to furnish those glorious mansions agreeably to his desires or the piety of his followers, he went before to solicit him for it by the representation of those his own merits, and the great piety, and faith, and patience of those who were to be entertained in them. And in this sense if we understand our Saviour (as I know no reason why we should not) we shall not need to convert his *preparing of a place for us* into that, which hath nothing at all like it, of *preparing us for it*; nor yet doubt of the expediency of his Ascending into Heaven to do it. For though his death alone were of sufficient value to compass our redemption and future glory, and, which is more, was the price of both; Yet it seem'd but reasonable (to give it its intended force) that it should be both represented to and pleaded before him from whom both that redemption and glory was to be obtain'd.

3. One other *end* there is of our Saviour's *Ascent* thus considered, even the being in a capacity to intercede for his respective Disciples and followers. An *end* not to be doubted of, if we consider what was before said concerning the procuring the gift of the Holy Ghost, or the more express declarations of the Scripture. For since even the gift of the Holy Ghost depended upon his praying to the Father, as we find by his own words that it did (*for I will pray the father, saith he, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever*) it must be confess'd, because the procuring of that gift was one end of his *Ascent*, that his interceding for us was also such. Only if that proof may not be thought to be sufficient (as indeed it refers to a particular intercession, and which is now past and gone) the *Author* to the *Hebrews* will supply that defect, because affirming him<sup>c</sup> *to live ever to make intercession for us*. Now there are three things that would be enquir'd into concerning that intercession for the making whereof we assure our Saviour to have ascended,

<sup>a</sup> Annot. in Joh.  
14. 2.

<sup>b</sup> Mat. 20. 15,  
16.

<sup>c</sup> Joh. 14. 16.

<sup>d</sup> Heb. 7. 25.

ascended, What *kind* of intercession that is, which he is suppos'd to make, What the *matter* of that intercession is, and of what *necessity* or expediency. Of the first of these I perswade my self no question had ever been made, if men would have contented themselves with the simple declarations of the Scripture. For what doubt can there be of a true and proper intercession, when we do not only find this of Christ represented by such *words* <sup>e</sup> as are wont to denote a true <sup>f</sup> and proper one, but, which is more, represented as an act of his *Priesthood* <sup>g</sup>, yea made use of by the *Author* to the *Hebrews* to prove that Office to have been vested in him? For who ever doubted the intercession of a *Priest* to be by way of supplication for those for whom it was intended? And though the present glory, to which our Saviour is advanced, forbids us to believe it to be done with that *submissiveness* which he us'd in the *days of his flesh*, yet nothing hinders (considering the distance there is, and always will be between our High Priest and the Father) that it should be made by entreaties, though clad in other expressions than they sometime were, and made more Authoritative by the representation of his own glorious merits. Not much more difficult will it be, to assign the *matter* of that intercession for the making whereof we have affirmed this our Messiah to have ascended; As will appear if we consider our own needs of it, whether as to the subduing of sin, or obtaining pardon of it. For since, however the Holy Ghost was long since sent down upon the Apostles, and, by the ministration of them and their Successors, transmitted to the Church, yet the offences of the members thereof may occasion it to withdraw its influences, and so leave them both under sin and the guilt of it; It seemeth but reasonable to believe, that the head of that Church doth by his continued intercessions sollicit the restoring of *them* and of Gods accustomed favour, and so deliver them both from sin and from the guilt of it. Not to say, that the external dangers, the members thereof are in from their respective enemies, make the same intercessions as reasonable, to procure their either deliverance or support. Which as it will give us an account in part of the *expediency* of that intercession, for the making whereof we have affirmed our Saviour to have ascended; so leave us nothing to add upon that head, but what may well be supposed to arise from that preeminency which we have assigned unto the Father: The preserving of that preeminency making it but reasonable, that his consent should be always *implor'd* in the administration of that Government which he hath committed to the Son.

But leaving off to consider any farther of those great emoluments, for the procuring whereof from God we have affirm'd our Saviour to have ascended, because even these depend in a great measure on our own behaviour and deportment; Consider we the same *Ascent*, as it hath a more immediate aspect upon us in conforming us to the pattern of it. For that our Saviour ascended for this end also, as well as for the other, we have not only to assure us his *leaving* his death to us <sup>h</sup> for an *ensample*, which <sup>i</sup> 1 Pet. 2. 21. if any thing may seem above our imitation; but those sayings of Scripture which oblige us to follow him yet farther, and *ascend*, as well as either *die*, or *rise* with him. For *if ye then*, saith St. Paul <sup>i</sup>, *be risen with* <sup>j</sup> Col. 3. 1. *Christ* (as every Christian obligeth himself to by his very <sup>k</sup> Baptism) *seek* <sup>k</sup> Rom. 6. 4. *those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God*. Thither you see it is that you are called by that Ascent which Christ hath gone before you in, as well as by the injunction of St. Paul; and

<sup>e</sup> ἱκετεύων  
vid. Rom. 8.  
34. & Heb. 7.  
25.  
<sup>f</sup> Rom. 11. 6.  
1 Tim. 2. 1.  
— 4. 5.  
<sup>g</sup> ἱκετεύων  
ubi ἱκετεύων  
ἔσται, pro precibus,  
seu precibus  
funderet.  
<sup>h</sup> Heb. 7. 24, 25.

<sup>h</sup> 1 Pet. 2. 21.

<sup>i</sup> Col. 3. 1.

<sup>k</sup> Rom. 6. 4.



thither therefore it is, you are to tend in your *thoughts*, and *affections*, and *endeavours*. In your *thoughts*, because without that, neither your affections nor endeavours will, and because whatsoever happiness you look for is treasur'd up there, and *hid with<sup>1</sup> Christ in God*, who is there. In your *affections*, for so the same St. Paul<sup>m</sup> expressly enjoins, and so that treasure, whereof we speak, also doth, or rather the impossibility of our otherwise obtaining it. For what likelihood of attaining that happiness towards which our hearts tend not, what likelihood either of Christ's bestowing it, or of God's furnishing him with the power of it? This being to debase his own unvaluable blessings, and which he would not admit even his own Son to the enjoyment of, till he made his way to them, I do not say only, by despising all the transitory goods of the world, but by suffering all the indignities and tortures it was in a capacity to inflict. But so also (if we may believe the same St. Paul<sup>n</sup>) are we to ascend in our *endeavours* and actions; so we are to do, if we would be thought to have either the title or hopes of his followers: The *conversation* of a Christian, however led on earth and among earthly persons, being really in the same *heaven*, from whence he looks for the Saviour the Lord Jesus Christ, and his own future happiness by him. A thing, which may the more easily be believ'd, because by the same Jesus from the beginning made the object of our desires, yea above and before our own pardon and happiness. Unless we can think, that he who prompts us to pray that *Gods will may be done on earth as it is in heaven*, were indifferent as to our performance of it, and as willing we should grovel upon that earth on which we tread, as conform to the obedience and piety of those *citizens* of heaven the Angels.

To return now to our Saviour, whose Ascent we are considering, and for whose advantage it is but reasonable to believe that that Ascent was primarily design'd, because the foregoing labours were purely his. Though if any doubt remain concerning that being the *end* of his Ascent, either in the intention of God, or in his own, the Scripture will easily remove it. For because (saith St. Paul<sup>o</sup>) though *he was in the form of God, yet he made himself of no reputation, yea humbled himself even to the death of the cross*, therefore God also did highly exalt him, and give him a name, not only above every name, but to which all other names and things should bow. Not unlike is the evidence there is for Christ having the same thing in his eye, when he made his Ascent into that place of joy and glory: It being but reasonable to believe, that he design'd in it the participation of that joy and glory, for the sake whereof (as the Author to the Hebrews<sup>p</sup> speaks) *he endured the cross, despising the shame*, and so at length, when he was in a capacity to mount up thither, *sat down at the right hand of God*; That, as the forementioned Apostle intimates, but the Psalmist<sup>q</sup> doth more plainly declare, being the place of joy and pleasure, as I shall afterwards shew it to be of power and glory. Thither therefore, especially being invited thereto by the close of that Article I am now upon, let us follow our Saviour with our thoughts, enquiring, as we go, what is meant by Christ's *sitting on the right hand of God*, and what evidence there is of that intendment in the *Scriptures of the Old Testament*.

<sup>1</sup> Col. 3. 3.<sup>2</sup> — 2.<sup>3</sup> Phil. 3. 20.<sup>4</sup> Phil. 2. 6. &c.<sup>5</sup> Heb. 12. 2.<sup>6</sup> Psa. 16. 11.

**I**T is a thing so taken for granted by all the *Expositors* that I have seen, And li-  
that to *sit on the right hand of God* is an expression purely and per-  
fectly Metaphorical, that it would make a modest man afraid, to enter-  
tain any doubt in himself concerning it, and much more to declare that *the right*  
doubt of his unto the world. But as I must profess my self to be one of *God the*  
those, who in plain and simple narrations love as little as may be to de- *father Al-*  
part from the letter (for fear lest such a departure should tempt my self, *mighty.*  
or others, to convert the other parts of them into Metaphors and Alle-  
gories) so I see not why we should altogether depart from the letter of  
the present *Article*, either as to that *place* where Christ is affirmed to  
have sat down, or as to that *position* itself. For be it (which is true  
enough, and constantly to be maintain'd) that God is not only a Spirit  
but an immense and omnipresent one, and so neither capable of a right  
hand or of a left; Yet as it would be considered, whether this immense  
Spirit may not manifest himself more especially in some particular place,  
and with respect to which therefore this Session of Christ may be under-  
stood, so also whether both the Scripture and the Creed do not lead us so  
to understand this his *going to*; and *sitting on the right hand of God*.  
That there are some particular places where God doth more especially man-  
ifest himself, and by reason whereof they have the title of the *Throne*  
of God, will need no other evidence than what we learn from the Scrip-  
tures concerning both the heavens and the Sanctuary of God. For with  
respect to this it is (as *Maimonides* himself acknowledgeth, who yet <sup>Duct. Perpl.</sup>  
hath been produc'd as a Patron of a different notion) that the heaven <sup>Part. 1. c. 9.</sup>  
is affirm'd by God himself to be his *throne* as well as the earth his *foot-* <sup>Grot. Annot.</sup>  
*stool*, even because of the more glorious manifestations he makes of him- <sup>in Heb. 8. 1.</sup>  
self there. And for the same reason, even because of God's revealing him-  
self in it, and placing his splendour and glory there, it is (as the same  
*Maimonides* observes) that the place of God's *Sanctuary* is stil'd <sup>Loco citato.</sup> "a glo-  
*rious high throne from the beginning*. Which makes me not a little to <sup>Jer. 17. 12.</sup>  
wonder, that *Grotius* should upon the credit of this Author and of this <sup>Loco citato.</sup>  
very place so crudely assert the throne of God generally speaking to be  
no other than the very Majesty of God. For though that learned *Rabbi*  
produce some places of Scripture where by the Throne of God can be <sup>Exo. 17. 16.</sup>  
meant no other than God's *power and greatness*, and, because there is no <sup>Lam. 5. 19.</sup>  
thing in God which is not God, *God himself* (Even as the word *Throne*  
when appli'd to earthly powers is sometime set to denote him who sits up-  
on it) Yet doth he as roundly assert, that *every place, which God hath* <sup>Maimon. ubi</sup>  
*destin'd to the manifestation of his glory and splendor, is call'd a* <sup>supra.</sup>  
*throne*, and consequently, because but a place, to be distinguish'd from  
him who manifests himself upon it. Now supposing (as I have before  
shewn) that wheresoever God more especially manifests himself, that  
place may have the title of his throne; supposing farther (as hath been also  
evidenced) that this title of a throne is competent to a place of narrow  
bounds, as well as to that vast body the heaven; What should hinder us  
to think, that even in the heaven it self there may be some particular  
quarter wherein he doth more signally manifest himself than in others, and  
which therefore may as well be entitled his throne in comparison of the  
other parts of it, as heaven it self in its full latitude is in respect of the  
earth. That this is not at all improbable, I suppose the premises do suffi-  
ciently evince, and particularly what hath been said concerning the *San-*

<sup>a</sup> Psa. 11. 4.  
<sup>b</sup> 1 Kings 22.  
 19.

Guery of God's being such. How much more then may we so think, when we find the Scripture speaking the same language, and erecting a particular throne, even in that more general throne the heavens? For thus we find the Scripture affirming that the Lord hath a particular throne in heaven<sup>a</sup> as well as that he hath the heavens for a more general one; yea we find it bringing in the Prophet Micajah affirming<sup>b</sup> that he saw the Lord sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him, on his right hand and on his left: Which must mean (because otherwise neither capable of being seen by the eyes of his body or fancy, nor yet of a right and left) that some more circumscribed one is to be understood. Which said, a way is open to shew how this sitting of Christ upon the right hand of God may have in part a literal meaning, without offering any injury at all, either to the spirituality, or immenseness of the divine nature. For, as supposing God to have a more circumscribed throne, that throne may rightly enough be affirm'd to have a right and a left side, so, in regard of God's being more especially present there, he who is seated on the right or left side of that throne to be seated on his right hand or on his left. All therefore that will remain for us to shew, is what presumption there is either from the Creed or the Scripture, that this sitting of Christ on the right hand of God is so to be understood. As to this being the sense of the Creed, I will not say much to shew, both because the Creed is but short, and because, if we can prove it to be the sense of the Scripture, that will conclude it to be the sense of the other. This only I shall take the confidence to say, that as no man denies a literal sense to belong to his ascending into heaven, and ought not therefore, without manifest necessity, to remove it from that session of his which is subjoined to it, and which no man either doth or can deny to be in the same heaven; So affirming, as the Creed doth, that Christ shall come from thence to judge the quick and the dead (for why should not the word thence refer to the nearest correlate, unless there were a necessity for referring it to a remoter one?) it supposeth the right hand of God to be the term from whence he is to pass, and consequently, that we cannot more rightly understand it than of the right hand or side of that Throne on which he manifests himself. But of all the Arguments, which do confirm me in my thus understanding the right hand of God, both as to the Creed and to the Scripture, there are none which prevail more with me, than the expressions the Scripture doth not infrequently make use of, to express this session of our Saviour. For thus (as it were to point us to the due understanding of it) we do not only find him describ'd as sitting on the right hand of power<sup>c</sup> and Majesty<sup>d</sup>, which may as well signifie the symbols of his power and Majesty, as that power and Majesty it self; But (which is more home to our present purpose, and may serve for an apt comment upon the latter of the foregoing expressions, as well as upon his sitting at the right hand of God) affirmed to be set on the right hand of the Throne<sup>e</sup> of the Majesty in the heavens, as again, to be set down at the right hand of<sup>f</sup> the Throne of God. Both which last texts do not only point us to a particular throne in that greater one of Heaven, but open a way to us to understand this our Saviour's sitting on the right hand of God without departing altogether from the letter of the Creed and Scripture, which without doubt, we ought not to do without a great necessity. For as for that fancy of Grotius before mentioned, of interpreting even this throne concerning the divine Majesty it self, it might have

<sup>c</sup> Mat. 26. 64.  
 Luc. 22. 69.  
<sup>d</sup> Heb. 1. 3.

<sup>e</sup> — 8. 1.  
<sup>f</sup> — 12. 2.



have some place, if it did not appear from the Scripture that things distinct from God, yea the places wherein he especially manifests himself, did receive even the title of *Thrones* from himself. That of St. Luke <sup>8</sup> ACT. 7. 55. shall put a period to this particular, because giving us a farther reason so to interpret this our Saviour's position *at the right hand of God*. For we find by that *Evangelist*, that, when St. Stephen was now upon his martyrdom, God, to confirm him in that holy resolution he had taken up to suffer it, presented to his bodily eyes the *glory of God* in heaven, and *Jesus standing on the right hand of God*. Which is such a proof of what I have been all along endeavouring to shew, that I know not whether a more convincing one can be produced. For since the *glory of God* is no unusual appellation <sup>b</sup> of that splendor or brightness where- Exo. 24. 16; by God doth oftentimes manifest himself; since by the *glory of God*, in <sup>17.</sup> the foremention'd Scripture, no other can well be meant, because what- Eze. 1. 28. ever the glory of God may be, yet God himself cannot be seen by the eyes of our bodies; It is manifest, because St. Stephen is also affirm'd to have seen *Jesus at the right hand of God*, that he saw him on the right hand of that *glory or throne of God*, and consequently that that is no inconvenient interpretation, either in the *Creed* or in the *Scripture*, of Christ's being seated *on the right hand of God*. Such evidence there is both from the *Creed* and from the *Scripture* of giving a literal sense, in some measure, to that *right hand of God*, on which Christ is said to have been seated; neither see I any reason, why we may not affix the same literal sense to that *posture* of body, wherein both the *Creed* and the *Scriptures* do for the most part describe him. For since *sitting* is a posture of Majesty and glory, for the attaining whereof it was that our Saviour did thus ascend; since our Saviour's body is of necessity to be assign'd some posture, and such as may best correspond with that glory to which he is advanced; Since lastly, this posture is for the most part attributed to him, and indeed no where deni'd but where there was a *particular* reason for it, and to give St. Stephen to understand his *readiness* to rise up to his assistance; What should hinder us from affirming this to be the *usual posture* of Christ *on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens*? For as for those places of Scripture <sup>1</sup> where Christ is simply represented as *being* on the right hand of God, they make nothing at all against the foregoing notion; Because he who *sits* at the right hand of God *is* as truly there, as he who presents himself there in any other posture. Röm. 8. 34.  
1 Pet. 3. 22.

It appearing from the premises, that by *sitting on the right hand of God* is meant his being *really* seated on the right hand of the *Throne of God*, enquire we in the next place, whether that *session* of his hath any farther intendment, or rather what are the consequences thereof. Where first I shall represent his both beholding, and enjoying that *pleasure and happiness*, which is to be found in the enjoyment of God; There being no doubt of his partaking of that pleasure and happiness, who is seated so near that *throne* of his, wherein he doth more especially exhibit himself. But neither can there be any doubt of his being clothed with the same *Majesty*, wherewith he by whom he is seated, doth shine forth; Partly because of his *nearness* to his throne, and partly because of his being affirmed to be seated *on the right hand* of it. For this being a position which denotes honour and glory, and so acknowledged even by those who would make it only *metaphorical* in Christ, it must

must consequently import a proportionable exaltation in him, to whom it is attributed by the Scripture. And though perhaps no Argument can be drawn from that meer *session* of his, to shew him to be advanced to a signal *power* and *dominion*, which yet must be acknowledged to be the consequent of Christ's advancement; Yet as by thus admitting him to sit with him under the wings of his glory he doth not obscurely intimate his admitting him also to a part of his sovereignty, so it is manifest enough from the Scriptures, that this was the consequent of that *session* of his, and that he was not only exalted to a participation of his glory, but to become a *Prince* and Governour under him. For, *therefore* (saith St. Peter <sup>k</sup> upon the account of the *Psalmist's* affirming him to have been seated on the right hand of God) *let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ.* And him (saith the same St. Peter <sup>l</sup>,) *bath God exalted with, or rather at his right hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins. He must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet,* said St. Paul <sup>m</sup> concerning the same Christ upon the account of the *Psalmists* affirming, *The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool;* for he, that duly compares those two passages together, will find that is it which the *Apostle* refers to. And of the same Jesus saith St. Peter <sup>n</sup> again, *Who is on the right hand of God, Angels and Authorities and powers being made subject unto him.* The only thing remaining to be enquir'd into, is what evidence there is of this session and the consequents thereof in the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and what proofs this Prince of ours hath given of his so reigning and commanding.

Now to make it appear, what evidence there is in the Scriptures of the Old Testament, of the *Messiah's* passing to, and seating himself at the right hand of God, there both to be glorified and command; I will produce first of all that *Psalm* of David, which I before alledg'd to shew his death and resurrection, and Ascent: That I mean, which, after an account of Gods *shewing* the *Messiah* the path of life, doth immediately subjoin, that in his presence is fulness of joy, and at his right hand there are pleasures for evermore. For being the *Messiah* could not comfort himself with the thoughts of that joy or pleasure, but by being advanced to the place of them, thus much at least may be infer'd from thence, that after his resurrection, he should be advanced to the place of them, and, because they are represented as being in God's presence and at his right hand, to the presence and right hand of God. But it will be said it may be, that there is no mention there of the *Messiah's* sitting at the right hand of God, and much less of the consequents thereof. Be it so; for neither is it my purpose to affirm it, neither do I, or need I infer so great a truth from one only passage of the Old Testament. It may suffice (which is all I alledg'd it for) that there is appearance enough from thence, of his passing to the right hand of God: Whether to sit there, and in what quality, let other places of Scripture judge, though we shall not go far for our information in them. For in a *Psalm* which I have before <sup>o</sup> shewn to refer to the *Messiah* (and which indeed cannot well be attributed to any other) the Lord *Jehovah* is brought in saying to this Lord of David and ours <sup>p</sup>, *Sit thou at my right hand, untill I make thine enemies thy footstool.* Which words as they are a sufficient proof of the *Messiah's* sitting at the right hand of God, yea of Gods intending

<sup>k</sup> *Explicat. of the word Christ.*

<sup>l</sup> *Pla. 110. 1.*

<sup>m</sup> *1 Cor. 15. 25.*

<sup>n</sup> *1 Pet. 3. 22.*

<sup>o</sup> *1 Cor. 15. 25.*

<sup>p</sup> *1 Cor. 15. 25.*

intending to glorifie him in it (for so the very *subjecting* his enemies to him doth perfwade) so the words that follow are as full a proof of his *ruling* and commanding there: It being there affirm'd, that God should *send the rod of his power* <sup>1</sup> *out of Sion*, and that accordingly he should <sup>2</sup> *both rule* <sup>3</sup> *in the midst of his enemies*, and bring *his own people* <sup>4</sup> *to bow their very wills to him*; In fine, that this *Lord at God's right hand* (for of him it is manifest that the Psalmist speaks, and not of the Father, because the *Father* is not at the right hand of the *Messiah*, but the *Messiah* at *his*) that this *Lord*, I say, *at Gods right hand* should *strike through Kings in the day of his wrath* <sup>5</sup>, and <sup>6</sup> *both judge among the heathen* <sup>7</sup> and *fill the places with their dead*.<sup>8</sup> For what words could be thought of, that are more expressive of that Sovereignty to which we have affirm'd the *Messiah* to be advanced? And indeed how inglorious soever our Saviours Kingdom sometime was, because the time was not *as yet* come, that it should have its full force and power, yet after he came to be seated *at Gods right hand*, it gave as full proofs of its Sovereignty, as either the foregoing scripture, or any other can be thought to import. Only because I have *elsewhere* <sup>9</sup> *Explic. of the word Christ.* given an account of this Sovereignty, and can therefore with more ease refer to it than repeat it, it shall suffice me to take notice of those *gifts*, which he *gave* unto the world upon his exaltation, and such as were not more marks of his *munificence*, than of his *power* and *greatness*. For *in* and *by* these he triumph'd over *sin* and *Satan*, because enabling those, on whom he had bestow'd them, to chase away mens infirmities, and evil spirits. By the same gifts he yet more triumphed over *sin* and *Satan*, because bringing men out of his dark Kingdom into a more light-some and heavenly one. By the same gifts again he triumphed over the greatest *Potentates*, because by the means thereof, either bringing them over to his religion, or giving force and scope to it, notwithstanding all their opposition against it. In fine (to let us see that this power of his was as *tremendous* as it was *angst*) by the same gifts he inflicted *death* upon those who dealt deceitfully with him as in the case of *Ananias* and *Sapphira* <sup>10</sup>, *blindness* upon those who withstood the progress of his religion, <sup>11</sup> as in case of *Elymas* <sup>12</sup>, and (during the times of the Apostles, if not <sup>13</sup> till the *Church* came to be assisted by the civil power) sundry *diseases* and *torments* <sup>14</sup> upon all, who were cut off by the *censures* of it. By <sup>15</sup> these and such like powers did our *Messiah* sometime manifest his Sovereignty, and hath in a *great measure* continued so to do to this very day. And happy they who shall so far profit by them, as to be induced to acknowledge it, before they come to experiment it to their cost in that *judgment* which he shall come from Heaven to exercise over the world.

From



# From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

## The Contents.

Of the places from and to which our Saviour shall come to judge; whereof the former is shewn to be the right hand of God in heaven, the latter that earth on which we now dwell (or some place in the air over it) and probably the same place from whence he ascended. Evidence from several Topicks of a future judgment, more especially from the either Dispensations or Declarations of God. A digression concerning that judgment which is suppos'd to pass upon the Souls of men immediately after their departure hence, and a farther confirmation of that more general one which the Creed prompts us to expect. Of the person to whom this judgment shall be committed, and after what manner he shall come to it. An address to the consideration of the persons that are to be judged, where is shewn who they are, by what means they shall be brought before that judgment, and in what order. Of the nature of that judgment, and the consequents thereof.

From  
thence he  
shall come  
to judge  
the quick  
and the  
dead.

<sup>a</sup> Exposit. in  
Symb. Apost.  
Sed priusquam  
propheticiis hæc  
eloquiis præ-  
dicta doceamus,  
illud necessariò  
arbitror admo-  
nendum, quòd ista fidei traditio quotidie nos vult de adventu iudicis esse sollicitos, ut actus nostros ita præparemus, velut  
reddituri imminenti iudici rationem.

**B**Eing to enter upon the Explication of those words of the Creed, *From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead*, that of *Ruffinus*<sup>a</sup> came into my mind, as a proper introduction to, and a Rule of all that follows. *This tradition of faith* (saith he) *would have us every day solicitous concerning the coming of the Judge, to the end we may so prepare our actions, as being, we know not how soon, to give him an account of them.* For as there is no consideration more proper to enforce obedience and piety than that of a Judgment to come, so no course, (for that reason) so proper in the handling of it, as to consider it with relation to practice. And therefore lightly passing over such *circumstances* thereof as seem least conducing to that, I shall insist especially upon those which are most apt to beget in us a due regard to that judge, whose coming we are here taught to expect.

We left our Saviour in our last at *the right hand of God* in heaven, and therefore must from thence expect his second coming: Which, beside the attestation of the *Creed*, hath that of the *Scriptures*, that more infallible, as well as more comprehensive *rule of truth*. Our *conversation is in heaven*, from whence also we look for the Saviour the Lord Jesus Christ, saith St. Paul<sup>b</sup> to the *Philippians*. And *The Lord himself shall*

<sup>a</sup> Phi. 3. 20.

shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel and the trump of God, saith the same Apostle <sup>c</sup> to the Thessalonians. <sup>e</sup> 1 Thes. 4. 16. The Lord Jesus, as the same holy man <sup>d</sup> elsewhere discourseth, shall be <sup>d</sup> 2 Thes. 1. 7. revealed from heaven with his mighty Angels; And hereafter, saith our Saviour <sup>e</sup>, shall ye see the son man sitting on the right hand of power, <sup>e</sup> Mat. 26. 64. and coming in the clouds of heaven. Which last text doth not only point out the general place from whence he is to come, but also the particular *ubi* in it. As indeed, from whence else should he come, concerning whom the Scripture hath said, not only that *the heavens shall receive him* <sup>f</sup> until the time of restitution of all things, but also that he <sup>f</sup> Act. 3. 21. shall sit at the right hand <sup>g</sup> of God, till he hath made his enemies <sup>g</sup> Psa. 110. 1. his footstool? Only as he, who affirms Christ to sit at the right hand of God till he hath made his enemies his footstool, must consequently be thought to denote that he shall continue there, till that promised effect be fully accomplished, and therefore also that he shall sit at the right hand of God, till that judgment shall be over, which shall subject those his enemies to him; So, to reconcile that his sitting at God's right hand with his coming from it, I think it but necessary to add, that though he shall come from the right hand of that heavenly place where God doth especially manifest his glory, yet the same glory shall descend with him to the judgment, and he still seated at the right hand of it. Which is the rather to be believ'd; I do not say only upon the account of our Saviour's affirming, that they should see the son of man at the right hand of God <sup>h</sup> and so coming in the clouds of heaven; but upon his affirming <sup>h</sup> Mat. 26. 64. that he should come in or with the glory of the father <sup>i</sup> when he came <sup>i</sup> Mat. 16. 27. to reward every man according to his works. For what more apt sense can be put upon those last words of our Saviour, than that the same glory of God <sup>k</sup>, by which he before sat, and where St. Stephen sometime saw <sup>k</sup> Act. 7. 55. him, should attend him in his descent, and cast its bright beams of light over him. Though if there be any whom these proofs do not perfectly satisfy, (as men will not easily be induced to digest those notions, to which they have been before unaccustomed) they shall need only to consider, that he, who affirms himself to come in or with the glory of the father, adds also and with his angels, as elsewhere <sup>l</sup> with all the holy <sup>l</sup> Mat. 25. 31. Angels. For what more forcible proof can we desire of the removal of that Court or Throne, than the removal of all those, who are the most glorious attendants of it?

The place from whence our Saviour is to come being thus found out, enquire we in the next place, *whither* it is he is to come. Where again, no doubt can be made of its being to that *sublunary* world, from which he pass'd when he ascended into Heaven: This, as it is not obscurely insinuated by the Creed, which makes the design of his coming to be to judge the quick and the dead, who both have, and must have their being here, till he shall be pleas'd to absolve and translate them, so is render'd yet more evident from the declarations of the Scriptures. For not only is it affirm'd that this Lord of ours shall descend <sup>m</sup>, or come down <sup>m</sup> 1 Thes. 4. 16. from heaven, but assurance given to those Galileans, who look'd up after him when he ascended, that the same Jesus <sup>n</sup> which was taken up <sup>n</sup> Act. 1. 11. from them into heaven, should come in like manner as they had seen him go into heaven. For beside that the word *come* implies a contrary motion to that of *going*, and must consequently denote a tendency, at least, to that world, from which he is said to have gone away; How

could he be said to come with respect to those who stood gazing up after him, but by returning to that place in which they were? Which renders it farther probable, what the *Jews* as well as many *Christians* after them have thought, that the *Mount of Olives*, or some place in the  
 1 Thes. 4. 17. *air* over that, shall be the place of Christ's judgment seat; this being the place from whence our Saviour took his rise, when he was taken up from his Disciples into Heaven. And indeed as the *Old Prophecies* are not without indications of this place, because not only making the *vally of Jehosaphat* <sup>P</sup> (which adjoyns to the Mount of Olives <sup>Q</sup>) to be the place to which God shall gather all nations, and plead with them there, but affirming that *the feet of the Lord should stand upon that mount*  
 Joel 3. 1, 2. <sup>P</sup>  
 Vid. Drus. An- not. in loc. citat.  
 Zechar. 14. 4. <sup>R</sup> when the great and terrible day of the Lord should come; So it seems to me not to have been without some presignification of it, that our Saviour so often resorted to it when he was on earth, that he discours'd from thence <sup>S</sup> concerning this judgment of his, as well as of that upon Jerusalem; In fine, that he pass'd from thence <sup>T</sup>, when he made his triumphant entry into that City; This, though a meek and kindly approach in respect of that which we are now entreating of, yet being not without expresse of that Authority and severity, which he shall then exercise, because overthrowing <sup>U</sup> the tables of the money-changers in the Temple, and casting them that bought and sold out of it. However as I will not contend with any about the place of Christ's judgment, as thinking it more material to prepare to meet him in it; so I will much less concern my self about the time wherein it shall be exercis'd. For how vain a thing must it be to enquire after that, which is affirmed by the Judge himself to be known only <sup>V</sup> to the father? How much more vain, that I say not also unprofitable, when, like other futurities, it may seem to have been hidden, that men might stand alway upon their watch, as knowing not what hour their Lord shall come?

An account being thus given of that coming of our Saviour, which the Article we have now before us obligeth us to expect, proceed we to consider of that Judgment which is the end of it, and for which he is here foretold to come. Where

1. I will shew that there shall be such a judgment.
  2. That our Saviour shall have the administration of it.
  3. Declare the manner of his coming to it.
  4. The persons that are to be brought before it.
  5. And lastly the nature and consequents thereof.
- I. Now there are three things which perswade the being of such a judgment, as the Creed obligeth us to expect.
1. The dispensations or declarations of God.
  2. The apprehensions of mens consciences, but especially before their death.
  3. The consentient belief of the world.

I. There are who considering the uncertainty of Gods present dispensations, and the frequent unsutableness thereof to the demerits of those who are the respective objects of them, have from thence argued, with great shew of reason, the being of a future judgment, to take a review of, and allot them more sutable retributions. It is not my intent to depreciate that argument, which I acknowledge to be of force, upon the account of that justice, which must be suppos'd to belong to God as such. For how shall God be just, if he do not some time or other sute his retributions



tributions to mens deserts in a more certain and steady manner, than he can now be thought to do? But because the present inequality of the dispensations of God's providence is no contemptible argument even against that justice, which is of necessity to be suppos'd to be able to infer from the other a future judgment; and because (as I have *elsewhere* <sup>2</sup> intimated) that Argument cannot be well assailed, but by asserting a future judgment, and which therefore will require some other principle to establish it upon, than that which it is intended as an answer to; Therefore I shall choose rather to prompt men to the consideration of those *expresses* God hath in all ages given of his justice, in the management especially of the more important affairs of the world. For as those *expresses* of his in conjunction with the *perfection* of his nature (to the acknowledgment whereof the sole creation of the world will lead us) must be thought to prevail above all the arguments men can make from the inequality that sometimes appears in the administration of it; so they will conduce not a little to the enforcing of that future judgment, which Christianity obligeth us to expect. For how can we well think, that he, who leaves no age without witnesses of his justice upon sinful men, will not take a time to call others to an account, and allot them the same fate and punishment? Especially when it is often seen, that men of equal impiety, and it may be of far greater go away without that punishment, which he is so careful to inflict upon others. That inequality which sometimes appears in God's dispensations, is some prejudice to the belief of his justice, it is so far forth also to the belief of a future judgment, and much more to the inferring a future judgment from it: But as much of the force of it is taken off by those illustrious *expresses* of his justice wherewith the histories of all nations abound; so it ceaseth to be of any force at all, as to the prejudice of God's justice or a future judgment, when laid in the ballance with those *expresses* God frequently gives us of his justice, and the knowledge we *otherwise* have of the perfection of his nature; Those *notions* being of more consideration, which are favoured by God's both nature and operations, than those which have no colour at all, but what they receive from some of the latter ones.

But because what God *will do* or *not do* is best known from himself, and indeed but imperfectly from his operations, therefore enquire we what *declarations* he himself hath given of his own intentions concerning that future judgment whereof we speak. Now the first that presents it self to us is that famous prophecy of *Enoch* preserved by St. *Jude* in his Epistle <sup>2</sup>, and which every one may see, both by the Prophecy it self, and <sup>2</sup> Jude 14, 15; the series of that Epistle, to respect that general judgment whereof we speak. *Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his Saints, or holy Angels, To execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him.* How so famous a Prophecy as this came to be omitted by *Moses* I cannot say, though I do the less wonder at it, when I consider how little is said by him concerning so many famous men before the flood, and particularly concerning *Enoch*, the greatness of whose piety prompted God to exempt him from the common condition of mortal men, and translate him, as he was, to his own heavenly mansions. I am as little able to say with any certainty, how this Prophecy came to be preserved, though it seems to me by *Tradition*, which was the com-

mon conveyance of those times, and by the assistance whereof I no way doubt it was, that *Moses* wrote the history of those times, at least, that preceded the flood. But as the Authority of *St. Jude* may very well suffice us, who look upon him as divinely inspir'd; so that the Jews were not without such a *Tradition*, their belief of a great day of judgment, and particularly the many *texts* of Scripture that are by their *Chaldee Paraphrast* drawn to that sense may satisfy any reasonable man. Only if it should be said that the Jews might collect it from some passages of Scripture, and particularly from that of *Solomon*<sup>b</sup>, which may serve for another proof of a future judgment, *for God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing whether it be good or evil*; As I shall not go about to deny, but that they might in some measure, and upon that account both so think and speak in their own persons, so I see not, why, if they did not look upon that doctrine as ancient as the world, they should have put such a comment as they did upon those words of God to *Cain*; *If thou dost well, shalt thou not be accepted, &c.* For what less do those words of the *Chaldee Paraphrast* signifie, *If thou dost thy works well, shalt thou not have remission, and if thou dost not well, shall not thy sin be treasur'd up against the day of judgment in which God shall take vengeance of thee*? And indeed, as it is hard to believe that men should ever in those ages of the world, when they had no Scriptures to inform them, have set themselves to the practice of piety without some revelations to them from God of a future judgment; so it is not unlikely that this so famous a one of *Enoch* might have had a great influence upon his own, and the following ages, which were not without Scriptures, but in which there was so little intimation of this important truth. Not to say, that possibly *Enoch* was singled out from the old Fathers for a translation, to give the greater Authority to this his Prophecy; yea to shew by that translation of his that God intended in after-times to consider of the piety of his servants, as well as of the impiety of others, and allot them the same happiness and glory. For though *St. Jude* takes notice only of the aspect this judgment was to have upon evil men, because that only was proper to his purpose, yet I no way doubt the Prophecy it self had also a regard to good men, and the benefit they should reap by it: *A judgment*, as such, concerning it self in the absolution and rewarding of those that are good, as well as in the condemnation of evil ones. Agreeable to this Prophecy of *Enoch*, were the intimations God gave of his mind in drowning a sinful world but saving righteous *Noah*, as after that in the burning of *Sodom* and *Gomorrha*, but delivering *Lot* from it. For those dispensations of his, to men of tolerable understandings, might serve as a document, that God would some time or other make a more general separation between the righteous and the wicked, and, because many of them pass'd out of this world without their respective recompences, take care they should find it in another. For if sin were so irksome a thing to God as to prompt him to send such dreadful judgments upon those guilty persons, who could think but that he would some time or other make inquisition after the sins of others? And if *Noah* and *Lot* were, for their righteousness sake, thought worthy of such deliverances and mercies, it was as reasonable to think that the same righteousness and piety should some time or other prove as advantageous to other persons. I can hardly obtain of my self (so full of such proofs are they) to alledge any declarations of God out of the Scriptures of

of the New Testament. Only to make my discourse so much the more complete, I shall take notice of two, where this doctrine of a future judgment is describ'd. For thus our Saviour first, after he had spoken of God's committing to him <sup>d</sup> the power of judgment, to let them know <sup>d</sup> Joh. 5. 22. more particularly what judgment it was that he intended, he gives his hearers to understand, that *the hour was coming when the dead<sup>c</sup> should<sup>c</sup> — 25. hear his voice*, yea in which *all that were in the graves<sup>f</sup> should<sup>f</sup> at that<sup>f</sup> — 28, 29 call of his come forth*, some according to their past piety, and his righteous judgment, *to the resurrection of life*, as others again, conformably to their evil lives, *to the resurrection of damnation*. Agreeable hereto is the doctrine of St. Paul who is frequent in inculcating that judgment whereof we speak. For so, to omit other places, because I may have occasion to produce them in a more fit season, he tells us in his discourse to the *Athenians*, that however God might for some time seem to wink at the both ignorance and impiety of former ages<sup>b</sup>, yet now he <sup>b</sup> Act. 17. 30. commandeth all men to repent, *Because he hath appointed a day, in<sup>31</sup> the which he will judge the world, in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordain'd, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.*

2. To the dispensations or declarations of God subjoin we the whether comfortable or dismal apprehensions of mens consciences, especially upon their departure hence. A thing which I should not have taken notice of, had I not reason to believe those apprehensions to be general by this following observation of Plato, as I find him cited by Justin Martyr<sup>i</sup>. When<sup>i</sup> Ad Græcos  
any man (saith he<sup>k</sup>) now thinks he is near his end, there doth then pos- Cohortatio p. 24, 25.  
sess him a fear and solicitude concerning those things which before he<sup>k</sup> Plato de Re-  
entertain'd no thoughts of. Those stories of hell and of the wicked's publi. li. 1.  
being to be punished in it, however before accounted fables and derided as such, do now disquiet his mind for fear they should be true. And he himself, whether it be through the infirmities of old age, or the prospect of any other such prognostick of death, doth now more than ever consider them. Being full of suspicion and fear he recollects himself, and considers with himself whether he hath injur'd any man. And if he have found in his life many injustices, he is no sooner fallen into a slumber, but like children affrighted, he starts out of it, and trembles and lives in expectation of evil. Whilst, on the other side, he who is conscious to himself of no injustice, is attended by a sweet hope, and such a one (as Pindar speaks) which is the nourisher of old age. Now I would fain know from whence those whether comfortable or dismal apprehensions of conscience do proceed, how they come to seize upon men, but especially upon their deaths? Were it not that men have naturally ingrafted in their minds, not only a knowledge of good and evil, but an apprehension of a futable retribution which shall be apportion'd to them, and which, because they do not find to be bestow'd with any certainty here, they think it but reasonable to believe shall be given them after their death. For however some men should be granted to have something in them of fear even from their natural constitution; yet it must be granted in like manner, that they are as naturally desirous of ridding themselves of all unwelcome guests, and might therefore be prevail'd by the force of their reason to be able to deliver themselves from the fear of a future judgment, if that very reason did not help to bring it on, and confirm them in those agonies which it occasions? On the



the other side though others should be thought to be as *sanguine* in their hopes even by their complexion, and to be ready enough to flatter themselves with the hope of a happy life after death, yet is it not to be conceiv'd, they would without very good reason have suffer'd themselves to be so far overpowered by it, as for the sake thereof to neglect their present pleasures, which they, who have entertain'd these hopes, have always done: As because a present certain good is preferable to a future and uncertain one, so because men are naturally so intent upon their present pleasures, that the generality of them would, for the sake thereof, forgo all happiness in another world; were it not that they did believe, that, if they lost the happiness thereof, they should fall into that misery which it threatens.

3. I may not omit to take notice of the *consentient belief* of the world, though it must be acknowledged, that, so far as the heathen were concern'd in it, it came not up to that *judgment* whereof we speak: Because what the heathen believ'd or delivered concerning it, respected rather the *souls* than *entire persons* of those that were to be judged: But as that is enough to shew, that they believ'd a judgment after death, which is all I aim at *present* to shew, and which Christianity by the proofs it affords will soon improve into a fuller one; so that belief of the heathen is a proof that there shall be a judgment, how willing soever men may be to put it far from them. For from whence so general a consent as this, but either from some general reason or revelation? Especially, where the greater part of mankind could promise nothing to it self by it, but a long, if not an eternal misery. Such evidence there is, even from reason and nature, of a judgment to be exercis'd upon us after our departure hence: But as the heathen generally plac'd it presently after mens departure, and many Christians have so far consented with them, as to assert the like judgment, as well as that more *general* and *remote* one which the *Creed* suggests; so it will not, I hope, be thought an unuseful digression, to enquire what evidence there is of such a *near* and *particular* judgment.

That it is no necessary part of the Christian faith to believe such a *near* and *particular* judgment, the silence of the *Creed* as to any other judgment, than that which Christ shall exercise when he comes from the *right hand of God* in heaven to judge both the *quick* and the *dead*, may serve for an abundant evidence. For who should dare to make that a necessary part of the faith, the belief whereof was never requir'd of those who were to be initiated into it? Of not less force is the silence of the *Scripture* as to any other judgment, than that which is here taken notice of by the *Creed*. For, whatever intimations it may be thought to give of a more particular judgment, there is no *express* mention in it of any other judgment, than that which shall at the same time award to every man according to his works. But as it follows not from thence, but there may be such a judgment, because many things may be true, which yet were never thought necessary to be believ'd; So I will therefore make as diligent an enquiry, as I can, whether there shall be any such judgment, and what kind of judgment it is. That there shall be something of a judgment immediately upon our departure hence, seems to me evident from hence, that the souls of dead men are, immediately upon their departure, assign'd a place of misery or happiness, agreeably to their past behaviour in the world. For thus we find the soul of the poor but pious *Lazarus* upon his death carried into *Abraham's bosom*<sup>1</sup>, as the

<sup>1</sup> Luc. 16. 22,  
23.

soul of the *rich* but voluptuous man into a *place of torment*: Neither of which could be supposed to happen, but upon the passing of some judgment upon men by God, or rather by his Son to whom he hath committed the power of judgment. For how, without an intimation from God or Christ, should the ministers of God come to understand, in what quarter of *Hades* they should bestow them? Or if they could, what Authority could they be supposed to have for it, unless it be from him, to whom the rewarding or punishing of all the Sons of men doth appertain? Supposing therefore such a bestowing of the souls of men presently after their departure hence, and we must also suppose a precedent judgment to pass, by virtue of which they are so to be bestow'd. All the difficulty in mine opinion is, *what kind* of judgment it is, and how far it doth agree with other judgments, and particularly with that *general* one, which is the subject of this *Article*. For the clearing whereof, it seems to me not improbable *first*, that departed souls shall immediately upon their departure be brought before the judgment seat of Christ, there to receive *at least* a sentence for the fate they are to undergo, till the time of that more solemn judgment. For what other can we make of those words of *Solomon*<sup>m</sup>, that, when *the dust shall return to the earth as it was, the soul shall also return unto God that gave it*? What other construction, I say, can we make of those words of his, than that (as the *Chaldee Paraphrase* hath explain'd it) it should return to God, there to stand before his judgment seat? It being certain that many souls can go no otherwise to him, than to receive their award or sentence from him. It is not less probable *secondly*, that their works shall then be scan'd *so far forth*, as may serve to found that sentence which is to pass upon them; This being but necessary to justify that judgment which is to pass, and approve it both to those that are present at it, and the parties concern'd. But as there is no necessity at all of making that judgment to look farther than the *intermediate time* between that and the general judgment, or to concern it self in *any very particular* scrutiny into mens past behaviours, because a more solemn judgment is to follow it; so there is evidence enough from the *Scriptures* (as I have *elsewhere*<sup>n</sup> observ'd) of this *first* judgments accordingly awarding but an imperfect bliss or misery: The Devils themselves (as appears by their demanding of Christ whether he were *come to torment them before the time*) receiving for the present but a small part of their punishment, and holy men, even here, looking through this *intermediate state* to that *crown of glory*<sup>o</sup> which God shall at the great<sup>p</sup> day of retribution give to all them that love his appearing. Only as the whether misery or happiness of departed souls will be an earnest to each of them of what they are afterwards to expect, because every man, by the doctrine of *St. Paul*<sup>p</sup>, is to receive from Christ's second as well as first judgment according to the things he hath done in the body whether they be good or bad; So that judgment therefore, which shall award that intermediate state, will have somewhat in it of the terrour of the following one, because, as *Tertullian*<sup>q</sup> spake concerning the censures of the Church, a prejudice of the future judgment. And for these judgments therefore, as well as for the ends before-mentioned, we are to understand Christ's sitting at the right hand of God to be; though the consideration of this end thereof was of necessity to be deferr'd, till I could have a fit season to shew, that there should be any judgment after death, which this *Article* did first of all afford me.

<sup>m</sup> Eccl. 12. 7.<sup>n</sup> Explic. of those words, He descended into hell.<sup>o</sup> 2 Tim. 4. 8.<sup>p</sup> 2 Cor. 5. 10.<sup>q</sup> Tert. Apol. c. 39.

To

To return now to that *general Judgment* which is the subject of our present consideration, and prosecute our intended enquiries concerning it: Only premising one farther text out of the *Old Testament* concerning the being of such a judgment, and so much the rather, because I may afterwards make use of it, to shew our Messiah to have the administration of it. Now the Prophecy I intend is that forequoted one of *Joel*<sup>1</sup>, where mention is made of God's *bringing down all nations to the valley of Jehosaphat*, and *pleading with them and judging them there*. That a great judgment is there intended the words themselves shew, and so far therefore will not need any elucidation of ours; But what kind of judgment they mean, and how to evince that whereof we speak to be intended, will require a more accurate consideration. In order whereunto I shall desire it may be first considered, that this judgment, whatsoever it is, was to be in the reign of the *Messiah*, or rather toward the conclusion of it. This I gather from its being subjoin'd to God's *pouring out his spirit upon all flesh*, and which hath not only that signal completion of it in the *descent of the Holy Ghost* upon the Christian Church to oblige us to interpret it, but the prophecies of the *Old Testament*, and the suffrage of the Jews. For however *Abarbinel*<sup>2</sup>, the better to maintain the prerogative of his own nation, would make a difference between that and the Gentiles as to the participation of Gods spirit; yet as he sticks not to acknowledge (as indeed he could not well avoid it) that by *all flesh* we are to understand all mankind, and particularly the heathen world, so he allows so much of God's *spirit* to fall upon them, as to bring them to the *knowledge*, and *service*, and *obedience* of God. Which being the known effect of the Kingdom of the *Messiah*, and so more than once declar'd, it will be necessary to consider this Prophecy, concerning the *pouring out of Gods spirit upon all flesh*, as relating to the reign of the *Messiah*, as that which follows concerning the great *judgment* there spoken of to be consequent upon it. But not any longer to insist upon this head, because even that judgment is by the *Jews*<sup>3</sup> so far refer'd to the *Messiah*, that they make him the Author of it upon the Gentiles, enquire we in the next place for whose benefit it was intended, which will bring us yet nearer to the thing we aim at. For the Jews, as their manner is, apply it to their own Nation, and make the heathen to be no farther concern'd in it, than as to that severity which it executes. And it must be confess'd that the letter of the Prophecy favours that interpretation, as is evident from the *first* verses of the *third* chapter of *Joel*. But as it is not unreasonable to think, when *Israel* was at that time the only people of God, that God should give those, that should afterwards become his people, the same name; So there is enough in the foregoing words of that Prophet to incline us to impose that sense upon it. For not only is it affirm'd that God should *pour his spirit upon all flesh*, which shews of how vast an extent the redemption of the *Messiah* was intended to be, but, immediately before the mention of this judgment, that *who-soever should call upon the name of the Lord should be saved*. Which shews that they who did so, of what nation soever, should have the benefit of this redemption, yea that *that very calling upon the Lord*, and not any earthly privilege should secure them. But it may be this judgment, whensoever to be executed, or for whose benefit soever, is not that judgment which we intend, but a judgment which God shall exercise by slaying the enemies of his Church. And so it appears, that the Jews themselves understand

<sup>1</sup> Joel 3. 2-12.

<sup>2</sup> Joel 2. 28.

<sup>3</sup> Vid. Hulf.  
Theol. Jud. li.  
1. Part. 1. pag.  
206, &c.  
<sup>4</sup> Gen. 6. 12.  
Deut. 5. 26.  
Psa. 65. 2.  
Isa. 66. 23.

<sup>5</sup> Hulf. Theol.  
Judaic. li. 1.  
part. 1. p. 66.  
&c.



understand it, and, after their example, many Christians; led thereunto by those *warlike* preparations that are afterwards recounted, and which may seem to be the manner of taking this judgment upon the Churches enemies. But as I will not deny (so exuberant is the sense of the Scripture oftentimes) but that such a kind of judgment might be also intended; so I cannot see, when such a judgment, as we speak of, is on all hands confess'd, but that we ought in a more especial manner to understand it here, because it is describ'd as a judgment upon *all nations* at the *same time* and in the *same place*. Which how they can save, who would have this judgment to be no other than what should from time to time be exercis'd upon the enemies of the Church, I must profess my self not able to discern. And though the notion of the Jews may continue entire for all that, because fancying a gathering together of the nations in the valley of *Jehosaphat*, and the *Messiah's* making havock of them there; yet it proceeds upon a fond supposition, which I have before overthrown; of this judgments being intended for the benefit of the Jewish Church and nation. For that being overthrown, this gathering together of the nations to fight with the Jews in the valley of *Jehosaphat* must fall together with it, and leave this judgment to be understood of that day when God shall call all the world before his judgment seat, and give his own people and Church salvation and mercy, but destruction and vengeance to those who have set themselves against it and him. I may not omit one very material circumstance, because it will give both light and strength to the forementioned interpretation: I mean that there is great reason to believe *Joel*, in that Prophecy of his, to allude to the *slaughter of the nations* that came against *Jerusalem* in the time of *Jehosaphat*. For there, as well as here the nations are brought in as gathering together to *Jerusalem* in a valley, but overthrown by God at the prayer of *Jehosaphat*, that God would take the judgment of them upon himself. Which suppos'd (as they, who compare the history of that judgment with the present Prophecy of *Joel*, will find themselves more obliged to confess) a way is open to shew how he came to describe this judgment as performed by a slaughter, and yet ascribe it to the immediate hand of that God who is represented as the Judge: the former, because that judgment, which the Prophet makes use of to describe it by, was perform'd in a warlike manner, though by the hands of those that were slain; the latter, because that judgment was so the *Lords*, that they, for whose salvation he interpos'd, struck not a stroke in it.

II. Now as after I have shewn that there shall be a *General Judgment*, I am in the next place to shew that our Saviour is to have the *administration* of it; So being of necessity (because a concernment of the promised *Messiah*) to demonstrate it out of the *Old Testament* as well as out of the *new*. I will, whilst that Prophecy of *Joel* is yet in mind, see if ought can be inferr'd from thence towards it. For not now to press the Jews with their own concessions, because there is enough in the Scripture it self to inform us in this affair; Whose words are those to be accounted which are recited by *Joel*, *And it shall come to pass afterwards, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh*? Nay doth not the very mention of his *Spirit*, and particularly of the *Spirit of Prophecy* (which is manifestly a part of it) proclaim the *pouring it out* to be the *Lord Jehovah's*? Now I demand, what *Lord* it is we are there to understand, that is to say, whether the *father* or the *Messiah*, who is elsewhere known by that

<sup>b</sup> Joel 3. 2.  
12.

<sup>c</sup> Psa. 68. 18.

name. If they say the latter, we have then what we desire, because it is the same Lord who speaketh afterwards of his gathering *all nations to the vally of Jehosaphat*, and *sitting down to judge them there*: Which because he could not do, being before *ascended on high*, without coming down from thence, therefore that also is to be understood. But be it (as the *New Testament* makes God to judge as well as the Son, though rather by the Son than by himself) be it, I say, that that Lord, who promiseth *the pouring out his spirit*, and consequently who is to *judge in the valley of Jehosaphat*, is God the Father? Yet is it necessary he should *pour out this spirit* by himself, nay have we not reason enough to believe, that he poureth it out by the ministry of another? For not only did he, whom we own for the *Messiah*, entitle himself to this sending of Gods spirit, and which is more give proof of that his claim by his actual exhibition of it to his Disciples; but the *Psalmist*<sup>c</sup> affirm the same thing of a Lord who was not the father, because one who *receiv'd those gifts* that he dispens'd to men. For what difference can any reasonable man put between those *gifts* by vertue of which God was induced to *dwell among the rebellions*, and that *spirit* which God promised by the Prophet Joel to *pour out upon all flesh*? There being nothing but that spirit of God, which can change *rebellions* men into such a temper of mind, as should induce God to *dwell among* them. Thus much therefore we have already gain'd toward the evincing of our design'd conclusion, that, though the father was by vertue of this promise to *pour out his spirit upon all flesh*, yet not by his own hands but by the hand of another, yea by the hand of him who was to be the *Messiah*. Which suppos'd what should hinder us to think, but that he is also to judge by another, yea by that very person by whom he dispens'd his gifts? Is it that the power of so great a judgment was too great to be communicated by God to him or any other? But beside that it is not unusual for Princes to communicate this power unto their subjects, however originally vested in themselves; the imparting of such a power is no derogation at all to him by whom it is imparted, but rather a farther commendation of his greatness: Because he, who judgeth in the place of another, is necessarily to proceed by that others laws, and so becomes himself an instance of the Princes Authority, as well as those persons whom he draws before his judgment seat? Is it then that the person we speak of was not proper for that office, nor for the honour of him that did employ him? But beside that it was but reasonable that he should partake of the fathers honour, who had done and suffered so much to procure it; The father having before made him the dispenser of his blessings to the world, he could not more effectually vindicate himself from the contempt both of them and him, than by making that very person their Judge, in whom he had been neglected and contemn'd. Is it lastly, that though God might, yea advantageously enough, have made use of him for a Judge, yet it doth not appear that he did; without which indeed we ought not to be very positive in affirming it, whatever either possibility or congruity there may seem to us in it? But neither will those places of the *Old Testament* suffer us to doubt of that, which I have before shewn from the Jews themselves to belong unto the *Messiah*: Because the *second Psalm* represents him as a King, and to whom<sup>d</sup> as such belongs to judge, yea as one who *should break his opposites with a rod of iron*; as again that *Psalm*, which speaks of his *sitting at the right hand of God*, as one who should *judge among the heathen*, as well as *place with*

<sup>d</sup> Explic. of the  
Deut. Com. 5.  
Part. 5.

with the dead. Which shews that there is not only no reason to exclude the *Messiah* from the administration of this great judgment, but all the reason in the world to attribute it to him, as to whose Kingly Authority and power it doth so properly belong. Thus the Scriptures even of the *Old Testament* speak, but those of the *New*, (as they ought) yet more clearly; Because bringing in our Saviour affirming <sup>e</sup> that *the father hath committed this judgment* to him, as St. Paul <sup>f</sup> not only vouching the same thing where he saith that *God hath appointed a day wherein he will judge the world* by him, but appealing to his *resurrection* as an assurance from the father of it: It being not to be thought, that, if our Saviour had without cause arrogated that power unto himself, God would have given so much countenance to his pretensions, as to have raised him from the dead. And happy, thrice happy the obedient servants of God and Christ, that they have *such* a Judge assign'd them: Not because they can reasonably expect any thing of partiality from that *Just* one; but because *first* the constituting of him a Judge is a sign, that God intends he should proceed with us by the same merciful measures, which he allow'd him to proffer us life and salvation on. Otherwise the appointing him a Judge would have been so far from being either to Gods honour or the Judges, that it would have serv'd so much the more strongly to reproach them with a departure from those terms which they had offer'd to the world. I will take leave to add *secondly* (as which is no more than may well be expected from so merciful a Judge, and him that constituted him) that his faithful servants may promise themselves farther, that he will help them out in their plea, and bring to their minds those good actions which they themselves may have forgotten, or such circumstances thereof as may help yet more to approve them. For thus we find merciful Judges inclin'd enough to do, and, so far as we can guess by the representation Christ himself hath given of that judgment of his, that he also will do: Because when those holy men, who are there represented by him <sup>g</sup>, as having *fed*, and *cloth'd*, and *ministred unto him*, could not own so much piety as he there attributes to them, he gives them to understand, that inasmuch as they had *done it to the least of those his brethren* <sup>h</sup>, to whom he shall then point them, it was in effect as, if they had *done it* to himself. In fine, if (as may well be thought) so great and glorious a judgment should awe them, when they reflect upon the manifold infirmities wherewith their good actions have been attended, it is but reasonable to believe he shall also cheer them with the remembrance of his past sufferings, and their ability to cover and extinguish them. Of so comfortable consideration is it to the faithful servants of Christ Jesus, that they are like to have no other for their Judge: But of how great confusion to those, who have rejected all his gracious proffers, may appear from hence, not only that they are not again to expect the like from him, as who is not then to make any such tenders but to judge of their entertainment of former ones, but that they may also expect the severest vengeance his *justice* will permit him to inflict; There being nothing more enraged than an abused clemency is, because nothing which hath a greater incentive to it. However, if the contemners of *Christ Jesus* should yet hope better from this their Judge (as even they can *hope against hope* as well as better <sup>i</sup> men) let them see whether the Scripture will not prompt them to the same *fearful looking for of judgment* <sup>k</sup> and *fiery indignation* to consume them. For wherefore else should the *Psalmist* put men in fear of *perishing* <sup>l</sup> *when his wrath is kindled* <sup>m</sup>

<sup>e</sup> Joh. 5. 22.<sup>f</sup> Act. 17. 31.<sup>g</sup> Mat. 25. 34. &c.<sup>h</sup> — 40.<sup>i</sup> Rom. 4. 18.<sup>k</sup> Heb. 10. 27.<sup>l</sup> Ps. 2. 12.



Rev. 6. 16.

but a little? And, which is more, St. John describe the same wicked men as so appalled at *the wrath<sup>m</sup> of the Lamb*? Were it not, that *that Lamb* will be more furious than any *lion*, yea become so much the more fierce for having been before of a meek and gentle disposition.

III. It appearing from the premises that there shall be such a judgment as the *Creed* describes, as moreover that he to whom the *Creed* ascribes it, shall have the administration of it; enquire we in the third place after what manner he shall come to judgment, the better to beget in men that regard which is due to it and him.

I. And here in the first place I cannot but take notice, after the Ancients, of his being likely enough to come in that *form wherein he was crucified*, and though not without great glory, yet neither without the

<sup>a</sup> Aug. li. 2. c. 8. de Symbolo ad Catechum. Veniet Christus ut iudex, qui stetit sub iudice: veniet in ea forma, in qua iudicatus est, ut videant in quem pupugerunt, & cognoscant Judaei quem negaverunt, convincet eos homo ille susceptus & ab eis crucifixus. Veritas Evangelica non tacuit cum cum cicatricibus resurrexisset, qui posset, si vellet, de corpore suscitato & clarificato omnem maculam cuiuslibet cicatricis abstergere: Sed sciebat quare in corpore suo cicatrices servaret, ut impleretur illud, Videbunt in quem pupugerunt, Zach. 12. & ut vulnera dubitationis in cordibus discipulorum sanaret.

<sup>o</sup> Zach. 12. 10. Rev. 1. 7.

marks of those wounds which he then receiv'd. For so I find St. *Augustine* <sup>a</sup> interpreting those words of the Scripture, that *they shall look upon him whom they pierced<sup>o</sup>*, and *wail* at the sight of him. For beside that those scars will more proclaim his glory, than that light wherewith he shall be then encompassed; Beside that they appear'd upon him even after he was risen from the dead, yea after that body of his had acquir'd some heavenly glory, as appear'd by his presenting it to his Apostles *when the doors were shut*, and *vanishing* they knew not how from them; Beside lastly, that the Disciples were told by Angels, that *the same Jesus, who was taken up from them into heaven*, should *so come in like manner as they had seen him go into heaven*, which may as well refer to his outward shape as other circumstances; There seems to me to be much of the same reason for his as yet pre-

serving upon him those marks of his wounds, as there was for his so doing during his abode on earth. For is it not the *self same* Jesus that our religion teacheth us to expect from Heaven, yea that very Jesus who was Crucified first, and afterwards rose again, and ascended thither? And was it not therefore at least convenient, that he should have those very marks to be known by, by which he before made faith to his Disciples of his being the same Jesus that was Crucified? Was it not intended, that the sight of him should strike grief and terror, in an especial manner, into those that pierced him? And can that be more effectually procur'd, than by the exhibiting himself with the marks of those very wounds which he receiv'd from them? For however the knowledge of his being the person whom they pierced, might bring that piercing to their minds, yet the sight of those scars they occasion'd cannot be deny'd to represent it yet more smartly, and therefore not improbably believ'd, where it is affirm'd that *that same Jesus* who was taken up into Heaven should come *so and in like manner* as they had seen him ascend thither. Which suppos'd, as with reason we may, both good and bad men will find enough in that sight, to exercise their respective joy and grief. For see, O thou holy Soul who art now to appear before the judgment seat, before whom it is thou art to appear. Survey that glorious body in which he doth appear, but which yet is not so glorious as to wipe off the scars of those wounds he receiv'd for thee. Behold *his hands and his feet*, and by those know it is no other than he that suffered for thee, and from whom therefore thou maist expect a merciful judgment. Yea behold that *side* of his out of which streamed *water and blood* to wash and nourish thee,

thee, and which, as a monument of so great a benefit, doth as yet retain the mark of that *Orifice* out of which they issued. For so doing, thou must of necessity believe, that he doth as yet retain the same kindness to thee; yea that that very wound shall plead thy cause, and open it self again to receive thee into his heart and favour. But see too, because thou must, thou that hast *pierced* this thy judge, that hast pierced him with spear or nails, or, which is more irksome, with the rejection of that life and salvation, which he purchas'd for thee by those his wounds. For canst thou with reason expect any favour from him, whom thou hast so pierced? Canst thou expect only an abatement of that torment which was of old denounced against thee? Dost thou desire life and happiness? Thou mightest sometime have had it, yea those wounds, the marks whereof he doth yet retain, are an irrefragable evidence of it. Dost thou desire only to be forgiven? The same wounds do forbid it, as which would be very ill requited, if *they* should be admitted to pardon, who have for so long time trampled under foot that blood which issued from them. In fine, wouldst thou pray only an abatement of thy punishment? But those wounds do not now appear to interpose in thy behalf, but to be as a witness against thee what great grace thou hast refus'd.

2. But because what was but now suggested is only *probable*, though probable to such a degree that I could not think fit to pass it by, and because the Scripture hath acquainted us with other circumstances of Christ's coming, concerning which no doubt at all can be made; therefore take we notice in the next place of his coming *in the glory of his father*,<sup>Mat. 16. 27.</sup> and which will serve for a sufficient document to those who either *love* or *fear* his appearing.<sup>2 Tim. 4. 8.</sup> For what may not good men promise to themselves from this glory? As on the other side, what may not evil ones fear from the approach of it? For beside that God knows how to order his own glory so, as to make it both acceptable and terrible according to the temper of those to whom it is to be exhibited (for thus that *pillar*, in which he appear'd at the red Sea, was *light to the Israelites*,<sup>Exod. 14. 20.</sup> at the same time it was *cloud and darkness to the Egyptians*;) That glory, wherewith our Saviour shall then be adorn'd, will be but an earnest to his Disciples of their being sometime encompassed by the same. For is he not their head, and shall he not be solicitous for them? Nay can his glory be entire, till those his members be also advanced? And shall he not therefore so order the judgment, as to make it prove to their advantage, and not only acquit them from their guilt, but approve and commend them? How else shall he consult his own honour and glory, nay how shall he answer his own gracious promises? For to deliver such persons from the fear of so glorious a presence, he hath already told them<sup>Mat. 25. 34.</sup> that he will not only pronounce them as the *blessed of his father*, but call them to *inherit that kingdom which was of old prepared for them*. Of no less dreadful aspect unto evil men will the glory of our Saviour be, because the glory of that God who is a *consuming fire*, and who, no<sup>Heb. 12. 29.</sup> doubt, will then display his terrors to those who have provok'd him, and whom he appoints his Son to condemn and punish.

3. I must subjoin, as being but an appendix to the former, our Saviour's coming with the *Angels of God*, or, as our Saviour sometime expressed it, with *all his holy Angels*.<sup>Mat. 25. 31.</sup> For as the attendance of these will be a farther addition to that glory with which he shall be then encompassed, that I say not also a principal part of it; so it confers alike

to the whether comfort or grief of those, who present themselves before his judgment seat. For how can the beholding of these be other than an unspeakable joy to good men, when they remember from the Scripture <sup>2 Heb. 1. 14.</sup> that these were sent forth during the time of their past life *to minister to those that were to be heirs of salvation?* When they can call to mind, that by these it was that their souls were sometime <sup>7 Luc. 16. 22.</sup> *carried* into paradise? As in fine, that they were but now brought before the judgment seat by their ministry, not *confusedly* with all that are to appear before it ( which indeed would have been an abatement to their hope ) but in the *consort* <sup>2 Mat. 13. 30.</sup> *only of holy and pious persons* like themselves. For all these are manifest indications of their attaining a happy issue from that judgment which they are immediately to pass. I cannot promise evil men the like comfort, or indeed any thing but the contrary passion from the sight of that glorious company, wherewith our Saviour shall be then attended; as for other reasons hereafter to be exprest, so because remembring from the Scriptures that they were appointed of old to *bind* such as they in *bundles* <sup>— 24. 31.</sup>, and *cast them into a furnace of fire.* For the preconception of this doth in some measure antedate their sentence and punishment, and make them feel in their imaginations what they shall shortly suffer from them.

<sup>2 Mat. 13. 30.</sup>  
<sup>41.</sup>

IV. All things being thus prepar'd on the part of him who is to judge, and he either seated on his judgment seat, or being on the way to it; it will be but time to turn our eyes toward those who are to appear before it. Where again we will enquire, who those persons are to be, after what manner they shall be summoned, and in what order.

I. For the persons who are to appear before it, the Creed tells us they are *the quick and the dead*, and the Scripture speaks the same language. <sup>5 Act. 10. 42.</sup> For *he it is* (saith St. Peter <sup>b</sup>) *who was ordained of God to be the judge* <sup>2 Cor. 5. 10.</sup> *of quick and dead*; And *I charge thee*, saith St. Paul <sup>c</sup> *to Timothy, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and dead at his appearing and his kingdom.* The only question that can be made, is what is meant by *quick and dead*, which yet will not require any accurate consideration. For however *quick and dead* may be capable of other senses though less proper, and particularly of signifying men's being either *alive* or *dead* to God and *goodness*, yet can we not with reason impose any other sense upon those words *here* than their most strict and literal one: As because most agreeable to the design of the *Creed*, which, being intended for the instruction of the generality of Christians, may well be suppos'd to have been express'd in the most clear and simple expressions, so because it is certain from the Scriptures <sup>d</sup> that more comprehensive rule of truth, that Christ at his coming to judgment shall find of both these sorts in the strict and literal sense of the words; The literal sense, where ever it appears to have perfect truth in it, being in reason to be preferr'd before all those, how true soever, which are farther removed from it. In stead therefore of any farther concerning my self about that which hath nothing at all of difficulty, I shall prompt you rather to look upon those words as comprehending all sorts of men, yea all the individuals of humane nature. For whatever be the sense of *quick and dead*, it is certain that all men are, yea shall then be either of the one or the other sort; though if any doubt can be made of that, St. Paul hath said enough to clear it. For *we must all appear* (saith that Apostle <sup>e</sup>,) *before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done*  
*in*

<sup>d</sup> 1 Cor. 15. 51.  
<sup>e</sup> 1 Thel. 4. 15.

<sup>e</sup> 2 Cor. 5. 10.



in his body, according to that he hath done whether it be good or bad. As indeed well may we think so, when we find him ranking himself in the number, though one of the greatest Apostles, and the best of men. For who can hope to escape that judgment, if even he could not do it, whose piety may seem to have been so apparent, as not to need to undergoe it? I say nothing at all, how clear soever from the Scripture <sup>2 Pet. 2. 4.</sup> concerning the appearing also of the Devil and his Angels before it; because as the Creed hath said nothing concerning it, so I no way doubt it intended thereby to prompt us to the consideration of our own proper concerns, which God knows are too great to admit of a diversion by that of others.

2. No doubt, as you see, being to be made, who those are who are to be judged, enquire we in the next place by what means they shall be brought before the judgment seat. A question the rather to be asked, because those who are naturally dead cannot come without a special assistance, and those who are spiritually dead will be as indisposed to it. But therefore, as the Scripture hath inform'd us, God hath taken care that he who is to be the Judge shall descend with a shout <sup>1 Thes. 4. 16.</sup> and both by his own voice and the ministry of Angels <sup>Joh. 5. 25.</sup> (of which some Arch-angel <sup>Mar. 24. 31.</sup> shall be the conductor) summon both the quick and dead to appear, and having by that call of theirs awakened these latter ones (for even they that are in the grave will easily be made to hear the voice of Christ and of his messengers) gather <sup>1 Thes. 4. 16.</sup> both the quick and the dead from their respective places, and bring them before that tribunal at which they are to appear. A thing which how grateful soever it may be to Gods elect, because conscious to themselves of having conform'd to his Laws before whose judgment seat they are to stand, yet cannot but be thought as irksome to those who have disobey'd them, that I say not a kind of antepast of that sentence they are to receive. It being not the least part of their punishment, to have their impiety and ingratitude so expos'd and censur'd, as it is likely to be at that tribunal.

3. I will conclude this head, when I have made a short remark concerning the order wherein they are to appear who are to be brought before this judgment seat. Not that there is any expresse mention of it in the Scripture, which alone can give us an account of it; but that thus much may be collected from thence, that as those Saints who are then alive shall not be likely to prevent the dead in this appearance, because both together to receive the effect of that happy sentence which is to be pronounc'd upon them, so it is yet more evident that good men shall prevent the bad, because together with their Lord to sit in judgment upon them and the evil Angels. And possibly these latter ones last of all, because of the use which God may make of them in accusing those evil men who shall be sentenc'd to eternal vengeance. For though God have no need either of their testimony or any others, any more than he can be suppos'd to have of a judgment seat, yet erecting a judgment as he doth, and by which no doubt he intends to manifest the justice of evil mens punishment (for otherwise he might satisfie himself with barely awarding to them their deserved punishments, as who is himself sufficiently privy to their impieties) it is but reasonable to think he will make use of the evil Angels to discover and witness their having committed those impieties, for which they shall be so censur'd and punished. However that be (which is not worth contending for) we have evidence enough of good mens being

ing judg'd and absolv'd and advanced to the judgment seat before evil men shall come before it. And then we may easily guess with what little heart they shall appear, whose judgment shall be so postpon'd: That preference of the good, as it is an early indication to them of what sentence they are to expect, so being likely enough to add to the bitterness of their sentence as well as expectation. For how shall they be able to bear condemnation by those, whom they did sometime so despise, and cannot even now (by reason of their abiding wickedness) but envy and repine at the exaltation of

V. The last thing comes now to be spoken to, even the nature and consequents of that judgment we are to pass. For the better understanding the former whereof, we will consider it with respect to those things which are to come under its cognisance, and then with respect to those persons to whom they appertain.

The things that are to come under the cognisance of this judgment are the *actions* of men so far as they have before fallen under the direction of the divine laws; whether thereby we understand such operations of theirs as are performed by the ministry of the grosser members of their bodies, or whether we understand the immediate operations of their minds, or such as require only the mid-wifery of their tongues. For beside that these latter operations are as much under the direction of the divine laws, and therefore equally the subject of God's judgments and censures; Our Saviour hath particularly remark'd concerning our words that we shall be justified or condemned by them, as Solomon concerning the more secret operations of our minds, that God shall not only bring every work into judgment, but every secret thing whether it be good or whether it be evil. For what other can we well understand by secret, when the opposition is not made between those secret things and works openly perpetrated, but between secret things and works, and which are equally capable of signifying the deeds of darkness, as those which are acted in the face of the Sun? Though if this ratiocination of ours do not satisfy, it is to be hoped that of St. Paul may, where he entreats of this very argument: It being his affirmation there, that this Lord of ours, when he comes, shall make manifest the counsels of the hearts, as well as bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and to give men either praise or dispraise, as they shall be found to have deserved by them. Which as it may well establish the hearts of those, who, beside the merits of their Redeemer, have good actions of all sorts to present before this judgment seat, so awaken the consciences of those, whose lives have, upon the matter, been one continued act of disobedience. For with what heart will they then be able to appear before this judgment seat, who know before-hand they are to give an account even of those words and thoughts of theirs, which they hardly thought it worth their while to make the object of their care?

The judgement being thus considered with respect to those things which are to come under the cognisance thereof, proceed we to consider it with respect to those to whom they appertain, and who shall be judged by and with them. And here indeed is a notable difference in the judgement, and which may serve, more than any thing else, to establish the hearts of good men, and both appale and confound the hearts of evil ones. For though it do not appear to me, but that good men shall have their evil actions judged as well as their better ones, because the Scrip-

ture

ture hath assur'd us in the general, that *God shall bring* <sup>1</sup> *every work* or <sup>1</sup> *Eccl. 12. 14.* *secret thing into judgment, whether it be good or whether it be evil;* Though it is hard to conceive how their evil actions should come to be exempted, considering both the justice of that judgment, and the use the investigation thereof may be of toward the aggrandizing or diminishing that retribution which shall be made them; Yet this all good men are sure of (because to be judged by Christ and his <sup>1</sup> *gospel*) that those <sup>1</sup> *Rom. 2. 16.* very miscarriages of theirs shall have a merciful judgment. For that law, by which they are to be judged, allowing pardon upon repentance, the alledging of that repentance must consequently take off the charge, and make them be as if they had not been at all. I cannot say the same of the evil actions of evil men, though to be judged by the same law: Because how gracious soever that Law may be to penitent sinners, yet it is as severe as any against impenitent ones; and consequently will not only leave them under the lash of those severer laws under which it found them at its promulgation, but charge them with the neglect of that mercy which it tender'd them, and so to add to their misery and punishment. Such is the nature of that judgment whereof we speak, and not unlike are the consequents thereof. For good and holy men, proportionably to their past piety, shall have a merciful sentence, and not only so, but a favourable and gracious one; They shall be invited to *inherit* <sup>x</sup> *that kingdom which is prepared for* <sup>2</sup> *Mat. 25. 34.* *them*, they shall be put into *possession* <sup>y</sup> of it, and of that *eternal life* that <sup>y</sup> — 46. is there. Whereas evil men, though with the like agreeableness to their past behaviour, shall be bidden to *depart into everlasting fire* <sup>z</sup>, yea cast <sup>z</sup> — 41. into it by those <sup>a</sup> who brought them before the judgment seat, and will <sup>2</sup> *Mat. 13. 10.* no doubt be as ready to put its sentence in execution. In the mean time, <sup>41.</sup> so far as we can guess, and possibly to give those evil ones an earnest of their future punishment, as well as to refine <sup>b</sup> that world wherein the just <sup>b</sup> *2 Pet. 3. 13.* are to inhabit, that Lord, who came to judge, shall set fire to the *Universe* <sup>c</sup>, and amaze if not scorch them also with it. And under these apprehensions I shall leave them, till I come to call them to a more near consideration of that *eternal fire*, to which this Conflagration shall light them, if they continue in their impenitency.



# I believe in the Holy Ghost.

## The Contents.

*The sense of the present Article enquir'd into, and that Holy Ghost, in whom we are requir'd to believe, shewn from the place this Article hath in the Creed, and the sense of the Church to be no quality but a person, yea such a person as is also God. The like evidence made from the Creed of his being termed Holy in respect of his energy and operations, of his receiving his essence and power from the Father, and probably also from the Son. The matter of the Article brought anew under consideration, and examin'd by the doctrine of the Scripture. From whence is shewn first, that the Holy Ghost is a person, yea a divine one; more particularly from the command that is given for the baptizing in his name, and St. Paul's joining him with God and Christ in his benediction of the Corinthians. Evidence from thence secondly of his deriving his divine essence from the Father and the Son, and in what sense he may be said to proceed only from the Father. The next place assign'd to the office of the Holy Ghost, so far as it respects that holiness from which he is denominated; Where again enquiry is made, what evidence there is from the Scripture of his being the Author of ours, to whom he doth impart it, and how this is consistent with the liberty of the will.*

2 Cor 13. 14.

I believe  
in the Ho-  
ly Ghost.

<sup>a</sup> Ruffin. in Ex-  
pos. Symboli. Ce-  
terum si solius  
divinitatis ra-  
tio habeatur, eo  
modo quo in  
principio dici-  
tur, Credo in  
Deum Patrem  
Omnipoten-  
tem, & post hec,  
In Jesum Chri-  
stum filium e-  
jus unicum Do-  
minum no-  
strum; ita  
jungitur, Et in  
Spiritus San-  
ctum.

**O**F the two first persons of the Trinity I have entreated hitherto, and am now by the direction of the Creed to descend to the consideration of the third; for such the Holy Ghost is both commonly deemed, and thought to be declared by it. Only because there are not a few who will not allow this to be its sense, and they who pretend to assert it have alledged nothing for that their pretence, but its requiring to believe in him, which is an argument too weak to suffer so great a truth to rely upon; I will, before I set my self to enquire into the doctrine of the Scripture, shew what reason there is to believe that the Creed had that opinion of him.

In order whereunto I will first of all alledge the place this Article hath in the Creed, and its distance from the Article of God the Father. For if nothing more were meant than some *virtue* or *quality* of God the Father, as the *Socinians* at this day suggest; what reason can be given why it should be remitted to this place, and not rather be mention'd among the other attributes of God the Father, which was the most proper place for it? Unless perhaps it should be said, that it was because of this *quality*'s so signally manifesting it self by occasion of our Saviour, and after his appearing on the earth. But beside that this *supposed* quality of God the Father was no stranger to the earth even before the appearance of our Saviour, and might therefore (if nothing more had been intended) have been remembered among his other attributes, as well as it is afterwards taken notice of in the conception of our Saviour; suppo-

sing,

sing, what is the only thing that can be said; that a regard was had by the *Creed* to that manifestation of it which happen'd by occasion of our Saviour, yet should the belief of it have rather been set immediately after his ascent to and session in heaven, as which did not only happen upon it, but is by the *Scripture* <sup>b</sup> ascribed to it. But not any longer to insist <sup>b</sup> Act. 2. 33. upon the place this Article hath in the *Creed*, though it seems to me no contemptible Argument against the *Socinian* interpretation of it; I will in the second place call in to my assistance the sense of the *Antient Church* concerning that *Holy Ghost* wherein we are taught to believe. For supposing the Church to have believ'd the *Holy Ghost* not to be a quality but a person, and not only so, but one who was also divine, and neither shall we find any reason to doubt of the *Creeeds* calling for such a belief of it, nor yet be at all started at its not more fully expressing it. For how could the *Creed* satisfy that faith of the Church, of which it pretends to be a summary, if it required less, as to the belief of one who was also God, than the owning him as such? Or how not be thought to have spoken it out sufficiently, supposing that to have been the sense of the Church, even when it only call'd upon men to believe in it? For the belief requir'd being in reason to be suited to the object of it, and therefore also, if the object be such, to apprehend it as a God; if it were the known and allowed sense of Christianity that the *Holy Ghost* was God, the *Creed*, by requiring a belief in it did clearly enough intimate the believing in it as a God, and both owning and revering it as such. Now that this was the known and allowed sense of Christianity, even before many men will allow the *Creed* to have been in being, will not only appear from what I shall afterwards alledge out of the *Scriptures*, but from the *Second Apology* of *Justin Martyr*, as it is commonly reckoned, and wherein he professeth to deliver, not the sense of this or that particular sect, and much less his own private one, but the sense of the whole body of Christians. For thus he <sup>c</sup>, where he returns an answer to the heathens usual imputation of *Atheism*, because the Christians had no belief in those Gods which they ador'd. *We confess indeed, that we are Atheists as to such as have the reputation of Gods among you, but not in respect of the most true God, the father of righteousness and sobriety and all other vertues, and who hath not the least mixture of wickedness in him. For him, and the son who came from him, and taught us these things, and the Prophetick spirit, or rather that spirit which spake by the Prophets, we worship and adore.* Than which what more clear proof can be desir'd of the *Ancient Churches* believing the *Holy Ghost* to be God, or, that suppos'd, than of the *Creeeds* intending such a belief, when it call'd upon us to believe in him; yea of that simple expression of its being a sufficient denotation of it? For being it was the known sense of the Church that the *Holy Ghost* was God, to profess to believe in him could not be less in effect than to acknowledge so much concerning him, whatever else may be supposed to have been at the same time connoted in it. Lastly, as this was the sense of the *Ancient Church*, and therefore also to be presum'd to have been the sense of that *Creed* which was intended as a summary thereof; so when the Godhead of the *Holy Ghost* came to be call'd in question (which is always the season of giving more full explanations) that Church which had hitherto contented itself here with the

<sup>c</sup> Καὶ μαχομένων τῶν τοιούτων νομισμάτων δὲν ἁδοιοῦνται, ἀλλ' ἔχοντες τὸ ἀληθεύειν, καὶ πατρὸς ὁμοιωμένης, καὶ σωφροσύνης, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετῶν, ἀντιστήντες τῇ κακίᾳ, δὲ ἀλλ' ἐκείνῳ τοῦ καὶ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ἵδον ἐλθόντα, καὶ διδάξαντα ἡμᾶς ταῦτα — πνεῦμα τε τὸ προφητικὸν σεβόμεθα καὶ προσκυνοῦμεν. *Apol. 2. pag. 56.*

<sup>a</sup> Vid. Binium  
Tom. 1. Concil.  
pag. 354.

simplicity of ancient times, did in the *Council of Constantinople* more fully declare it; After that passage in the *Nicene*, *And in the Holy Ghost*, adding moreover <sup>d</sup>, *the Lord and giver of life, which proceedeth from the father, who with the father and the son is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the Prophets.*

<sup>e</sup> Introduc't. to  
the Explicat. of  
the Ap. Creed.

I shall not need to say much concerning that title of *Holy* which, in contradistinction to the *Father* and *Son*, is here attributed to this *Ghost* or *Spirit*: As because there can be no doubt of the other two persons being equally *Holy* in themselves, and therefore the title of *Holy* to refer not so much to his nature as operations, and the peculiar energy he hath in their making us such; So because *Tertullian* (as was before <sup>e</sup> observ'd) in one of his accounts of this summary of faith describes this *Holy Ghost* as one who *acquaints* believers, and in another, as the *sanctifier* of all those who believe in the ever blessed Trinity. Which shews farther, what opinion that *Father* had of the title of *Holy*, or rather what was the sense of the *Creed* it self concerning it. Agreeable hereto is the exposition of *Ruffinus*, and more than which in so plain a matter will not be necessary to be added. For after he <sup>f</sup> had said, that,

<sup>f</sup> *Ruffin. Exposit. in Symbolum.*  
*Ut ergo fiat distinctio personarum*  
*affectionis vocabula secretum;*  
*quibus ille Pater intelligatur, ex*  
*quo omnia, & ipse non habeat Pa-*  
*trēm; Filius vero, tanquam qui*  
*ex Patre natus sit; & Spiritus*  
*sanctus, tanquam de Dei ore pro-*  
*cedens, & cuncta sanctificans.*

to shew the distinction there is between the persons, the *Creed* had made use of their proper affections to describe them by; as in order to the confirmation of that, instanc'd in the same *Creed*s describing the *First* person under the title of *Father* as of whom are all things, and he himself from none; and the *Second* under the title of the *Son* as who was begotten of him; He makes the characteristick affec-

tion of the third to consist in his proceeding from or being breathed out of the mouth of God, and *sanctifying* all things. Thereby plainly referring the title of *Holy* to the peculiar energy he hath in the instilling of that most excellent quality into all that are thought worthy of it.

I cannot forbear to add, having so fair a hint from the forequoted passage of *Ruffinus*, that there is evidence enough from the words of the *Creed*, of its denoting in some measure this *Holy Ghost*s deriving both the nature and power he hath from another, and particularly from that *Father* of whom are all things, as both *Ruffinus* and the *Scripture* speak. For when it is apparent that the *Holy Ghost* is not more of a *spiritual* nature than either the *Father* or the *Son*; what other account can well be given either of the *Creed* or the *Scriptures* appropriating the title of *Spirit* to him, than that (as the forementioned Author hath observ'd) he derived his essence and power from that *Father* of whom are all things, and was, as it were, breathed out of the mouth of God.

Shall I go one step farther? It may perhaps be thought a bold adventure; but truth (no more than other things) is not to be attain'd without it. For what if I should also say, that there is evidence, even from the *Creed*, of this *spirit* of God's proceeding from the *Son* as well as from the *Father*, which is the utmost that is affirm'd concerning him? As perhaps I may, if we consider this *spirit* of Gods receiving his divine essence from another, and the order wherein he here stands as to the other persons of the Trinity. For supposing him to be third in the order of nature as he is there plac'd, and accordingly that the *Son*, though not in time, is in order of nature before him; and we shall find our selves obliged to grant, that he derives this his essence from the *Son*, as well as that he derives it from the *Father*. For the *Father* communicating his  
Godhead



Godhead to the Son, antecedently, in the *order of nature*, to his communicating it to the Holy Ghost; and we must also suppose (because thereby, as our Saviour speaks <sup>8</sup>, making that which is *his own* to become the *Sons*, also) that there must be a concurrence in the Son to that communication which is made of it to the Holy Ghost, because in order of nature after that which was made of it to himself. For how can the Son be suppos'd not to have an interest in the communication of that Divine Nature, which by being the Son of God he is as fully vested in, as that Father from whom he did receive it?

An account being thus given of the genuine sense of the present *Article*, so far as we have been able to discover it without the help of Scripture, I will now, to give so much the more light and strength to it, resume the matter of it anew, and allot it a more particular consideration. For my more advantageous performance whereof I will proceed in this method.

1. I will enquire what this *Holy Ghost* is.
2. From whence he deriv'd his being.
3. What his office is, or at least as to that Holiness from which he is here denominatèd.

I. I said in the general Explication of this *Article*, that we are to look upon that *Holy Ghost*, in *whom* we are here taught to believe, as a *person* and not a *quality*, and not only so, but as such a person who is really *divine*, yea replenish'd with that *Godhead* wherewith both the Father and the Son are. I come now to confirm that notion out of the doctrine of the *Scripture*, to which I have in part referr'd my self for the probation of it. And certainly would, or could men be induced to read the *Scripture* with a sincere mind, they would find both the one and the other in it; they would see enough there to oblige them to believe the *Holy Ghost* to be a *person*, yea such a person as is also *God*. For what is the notion that all men have of a *person*, but a *being that subsists by a power inherent in it self* (for even qualities, if they are any thing else than conceptions of our minds, must be allowed a subsistence) and is moreover endow'd with reason and freedom of will? Or what more certain way have we (if yet we have any other, where the *being* in question falls not under our senses) what more certain way, I say, have we to come to the knowledge of such a being, than by the proofs it gives of it self in its operations? For if we suppose it to operate by a power inherent in it self, we must also suppose it to subsist after the same manner; and if we suppose it to operate wisely and freely, we must also suppose it to be endu'd with that reason and wisdom which is necessary to the performance of it. Now what is there in all this which we may not find to be attributed to the *Spirit of God* by clear and undoubted testimonies of Scripture, yea by that account which our Saviour gave of him, when he was now about to leave his Disciples? *Nevertheless*, saith he <sup>h</sup>, *I tell you the truth, it is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away the comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send him unto you*; Not altogether by his own Authority (because though he had an equal <sup>i</sup>, yet but an equal interest in him <sup>14</sup> with the father) but by also *praying the father* <sup>k</sup>, and who should accordingly both *give* and *send* him in his name. That done (as our Saviour goes on <sup>l</sup>) this comforter shall certainly come, and when he is come he <sup>j</sup> will reprove the world of sin and of righteousness and of judgment.

But

\* — 13, 14. But for you my Disciples and followers, he shall *guide you* <sup>m</sup> *into all truth*, for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak, yea he shall shew you things to come. In fine, not only shall he concern himself for your benefit, but for my honour; for he shall glorify me also, and, that he may the better do it, he shall take of mine and shew it unto you. For can question be made, after all these testimonies, of the *Spirit of Gods* operating by a power inherent in it self, and not (as qualities do) as subjected in and actuated by some other being? When it appears from those words of our Saviour before remembred, that he is *sent* by the Father and him; yea when it appears that he comes as well as is sent, that he speaks as well as hears, and exhibits as well as receives. For how can the Holy Ghost be said to be sent by them, in whom he is always subjected, and who, by being so, cannot be supposed either to go or operate in any other place or manner, than as those persons do in whom he is so subjected? How much less, supposing him to be subjected in God and Christ, to come as well as to be sent, to speak as well as hear, and (which is to the same effect) exhibit what he hath receiv'd? For how, if only a quality, could he come from those whose quality he is (which yet is affirmed concerning this supposed one) when it is apparant that qualities pass no whither but with their subjects? How, if only a quality, could he utter the will of God, and not only so, but upon a *preconception* in himself of that will which he so uttered? For beside that these are the best expressions we have to denote the operations of an intelligent agent; to apprehend and utter are two very different things, and therefore if perform'd by qualities, to be perform'd not by a single but different ones. Not unlike is the evidence we have, from the operations of Gods spirit, of his being endu'd with *reason* and *freedom of will* which is the only thing farther requir'd to denominate him a person: Witness for the former, our Saviours affirming him to *reprove the world of sin and of righteousness and judgment*, which are certainly the operations of an intelligent agent, to lead men into all truth, yea into the knowledge of future ones; for both the one and the other, St. Pauls affirming this spirit of God to *search into* <sup>n</sup> and *know the deep things of God*; as elsewhere that he is not only the *dispenser* of all those glorious gifts by which the Church is enlightned and edified, but that he *divideth* of those gifts to every one <sup>o</sup> as he will. Which last expression whilst I reflect upon, I cannot but stand amaz'd, that any one should continue to look upon him as other than a true and real person. For what more convincing proof can any one have of the being of a person, than his acting with liberty of will, and influencing those he doth, after the inclinations of his own mind: Qualities, however they may be supposed to act, yet acting by necessity of nature, or at least as they are conducted by those subjects to which they appertain. Only if it should be said (as I find the *Posthumous Annotations* of *Grotius* look that way) that this freedom whereof we speak is not to be attributed to that Spirit it self, but to that God and the Father whose Spirit it is said to be; I shall desire him, in whom any such scruple remains, to consider of the distinction that is just before <sup>p</sup> made between this Spirit and the Father and the Son, to all whom those operations are ascribed. For when those operations are ascribed to the *spirit* of God distinctly and apart from God and the Lord, which are the usual descriptions of the Father and the Son; What man of reason or modesty, but must refer this freedom

\* 1 Cor. 2. 10,  
11.

\* 1 Cor. 12. 11.

\* 1 Cor. 12. 4,  
5, 6.

freedom of acting to the Spirit of God, and not to him whose Spirit he is? Especially when the Apostle affirms that it is *that one and the self same Spirit* which divideth to every man severally as he will. But what now do the Socinians return to all this? For we are not to think such Masters of reason can be ever unprovided of an Answer. And neither are they, yea of such an answer as looks plausibly enough, and may go a great way with those who can swallow any interpretation, of which words may be thought to be capable, how little likelihood soever there is of its being intended in them: For are we yet to learn that it is no way unusual to attribute even personal actions to qualities? Nay are we so little vers'd in St. Paul's Writings, as to be ignorant of his often doing it? Is there not a noble instance of such a *προσωποποιία* in that Apostle's Elogy of *Charity*? <sup>1 Cor. 13. 4. &c.</sup> Doth he not there attribute to it a long series of operations, and such as cannot be properly ascrib'd but to him who is acted with that noble grace? And shall we then suffer our selves to be prevail'd upon by such expressions as those, to make a person of the Holy Ghost? Shall we not rather with them, and agreeably to the dictates of our own minds (which cannot well digest a Trinity) look upon it as only a power or quality of the Deity, and by which he, in whom it is, produceth such admirable works? For answer to which I shall desire it may first of all be observed, that such expressions as those, even by the confession of the Adversaries, do most properly relate to persons, and, as I should therefore think, ought not otherwise to be construed, where the matter entreated of, doth not evidently require another interpretation. For how otherwise shall either sacred or prophane Writers acquaint us with their mind, or we come to a due understanding of it? How shall we know when that, which is describ'd, is intended as a person, and when as only a quality thereof? For words being the only mean whereby we can come to understand one another's mind; if the propriety thereof be not carefully preserv'd, all intelligence must fall together with it, and our knowledge be either none at all or very uncertain. This therefore should be the mark at which all Writers ought to aim, and this we may well imagine the Penmen of the Scriptures would, especially in so important an argument as that of the divine nature; and we therefore to look upon that description they give of the Holy Ghost as of a person, as a strict and proper one, unless some evident necessity require our otherwise understanding of it. All therefore that remains to enquire, is whether there be any such necessity, and what we ought to look upon as such. In order whereunto I must again distinguish between that necessity which may seem to lie upon us from the pure dictates of our minds, and such as may seem to lie upon us from the Revelations of God. For considering on the one hand how dark the nature of God is, and how impossible for us (even our own reason being judge) by the help of that reason to comprehend it; and considering on the other hand, that God, who to be sure doth best understand his own nature, hath made no contemptible revelations concerning it; I think it but just to prescribe against any such necessity which our *bare* reason may offer from the difficulty of apprehending any other than one divine person: Because there is more reason, in a thing of so incomprehensible a nature as that of God is, to trust to that which we have cause to believe to be the Oracles of God, than our own only reason and judgment. And indeed the case is plain as to those who write themselves Christians, and who, by being such, profess to own the Scriptures as Gods word. For after the admission of that there can be no place for any contrary ratiocinations,



ons, and they must either cease to believe the Scriptures to be God's word, and so consequently to be Christians, or suffer themselves to be bound up by them. If there be any necessity to put a different sense upon those texts of Scripture which speak of the Holy Ghost as a divine person, it must arise not from that light which meer reason offers, but from other and more clear places of Scripture. But so far are any such places from appearing, how diligent soever the adversaries of this truth have been to hunt them out; that we find on the contrary that the personality of the Holy Ghost is not only favour'd by the texts *before* quoted for a *plurality* of persons, and more by those which relate to the *divinity* of the Son, but (which is of yet more force) by such as more particularly respect that Holy Ghost of whom we are now discoursing. For agreeably to those Scriptures which speak of him as of a *person* we find him elsewhere join'd with those who are certainly *such*, and in the *same* condition and predication. Thus St. *John*<sup>1</sup>, where he speaks of the *Witnesses* Christianity hath in Heaven, represents *him* together with the *father* and the *word*, yea as *one* with them in *nature* as well as in *testimony*; and our *Saviour*<sup>2</sup> gives order for the baptizing in *his* name<sup>3</sup>, at the same time he enjoins the baptizing in his *fathers* and his *own*. Thus again, where St. *Paul* speaks concerning those *gifts*, which are oftentimes entitled by his name, he represents this Holy Ghost as *conferring*<sup>4</sup> those gifts as well as either *God* or our *Lord*, and the same *Apostle* elsewhere, in that benediction which the Christian Church hath taken up from him, joins the<sup>5</sup> imploring the *Communion of the Holy Ghost* together with that of the *love of God* and the *grace of our Lord Jesus Christ*. For how, if the Holy Ghost were only a quality, came he to be thus join'd in so considerable predication with those who were certainly persons? how came his name to be made, equally with the other, the object of our belief and hope? Nay why was he not rather distinguish'd by such characteristicks, that men might easily come to understand in what condition they were to look upon him? For though they, who believe him to be a person, do, because also believing him to be a person *proceeding from* the father and *sent by* him, acknowledge themselves indebted to the father for the influences of his grace; yet do they not acknowledge it to such a degree, as they who believe the Holy Ghost to be only a quality, and as in truth the father ought to be acknowledged, if the Holy Ghost were no more than such: Because the former divide those acknowledgments between the father and the Holy Ghost, which the latter give wholly and solely to the person of him to whom this supposed quality doth appertain. But let us approach yet nearer to this so formidable *Prosopopœia*, and see whether we have not as much reason to exclude it, upon the account of its inconsistency with many things that are affirm'd of the Holy Ghost, as well as upon the reason we have otherwise to believe, that what was spoken of the Holy Ghost (where he is represented as a person) was intended as a strict and proper description of him. It is sufficiently known, and must be acknowledged by the *Socinians* themselves, that, when personal actions are attributed unto qualities, it is only upon the account of their being the means, in the virtue whereof those actions come to be perform'd by the persons in whom they are. By which reasoning, the actions so attributed unto qualities must be acknowledged to belong to the persons in whom those qualities are. For thus, to go no farther than their own so famous an instance concerning *Charity*, that great grace is therefore affirm'd to *believe*, and

hope,

*hope, and endure all things* ; because those , in whom it is , are by that grace enabled for it, yea do actually perform by it all the operations there describ'd. And had no more been attributed to the Holy Ghost, than what the Father, by the means of it , may be supposed to effect, their allegation of a *Prosopopeia* would be so far pertinent and cogent. But who knows not, or at least may not, that several of those things which are attributed to the Holy Ghost, cannot with any the least shadow of reason be ascribed unto the Father ? I instance first of all in the Holy Ghosts *coming* to the world upon the *intimation* he receiv'd for that purpose from the Father and the Son, and as he is *sent* by them both. For let any man, that can , make sense of this coming of his, supposing the Holy Ghost to be a quality ; nay let him free it, if he can altogether, from a kind of Blasphemy. For must it not also be affirm'd by this reason that the Father comes himself upon an intimation from himself, nay must it not also be affirm'd that he comes upon the sending of his Son ? Which what is it but to make the Father far less than we our selves dare pretend to, because making it as proper for the Son to send him, as it was for him to send the Son ? Again is it not affirm'd, that this Holy Ghost, whatever he is, should *speak* unto the world, but withal no other things than he should *hear* from the Father, nay than he should both *hear* and *receive* from Christ ? For concerning this Holy Ghost doth our Saviour expressly affirm , that he should *take of his* and *shew it unto the world*. But by this reason the Father , whose this Holy Ghost is, must be also thought to speak unto the world , but only as he should before hear from another , yea as he should hear and receive from the Son. Which with what patience those men can think of, if they do at all think of it, who seem so jealous of the Fathers honour , is a thing which I am not able to understand. One only thing there is which may serve in some measure to take off from that incongruity, which seems to be in those and other the like expressions: And that is by supposing a *metaphor* as well as a *Prosopopeia*, and so making this *coming* and *speaking* of the Holy Ghost upon the intimation of another , to signify no other than the operating of this divine quality of the Father, as it is exerted by the Father and directed if not exerted by the Son. But beside that such figures as those are not any farther to be suppos'd, than there is very good reason for ; neither so can we avoid to affirm the operating of the Father, as he is managed by the influences of the Son. For beside that the Son is affirmed to send the Holy Ghost, as well as pray the Father to do it ; neither can we apprehend this sending of his to be without the same influence, as to the operating of the Holy Ghost, which must be acknowledged to belong unto the Father: Because the same Son doth not only affirm that whatsoever the Father hath is his, but that this Holy Ghost should *take from him*, as well as from the Father, to produce his operations in the world. By which means (as was before intimated, but can never be too often repeated) this divine quality of the Father, or rather the Father himself, shall, contrary to that prerogative which is allowed unto him by our selves, come to be managed by him who receives his Godhead from him ; which is, in mine opinion, a greater contumely to him, than they who assert a Trinity can be supposed to be guilty of.

I have insisted thus long upon the *personality* of the Holy Ghost, partly because that is the principal thing in question, and partly because, that being granted, it will be easy to shew that he is a divine one, yea such a person as is also God. For beside that it is not affirm'd, that he was a crea-

ted being, and therefore, if a person, an increated one, and consequently God; the Scripture doth, without any hesitancy, ascribe to him all those things which can be supposed to belong unto a God. Is the *name* of God one of those things by which a divine person is to be known? This is manifestly attributed to him, where that lie which is said to have been committed against the *Holy Ghost* is affirmed in the very next verse (and for no other reason for ought appears, than because the *Holy Ghost* is such) to be committed against *God*. Are the *attributes* of God another mean to know a divine person by, and particularly his *omniscience* and *omnipresence*? It is affirmed concerning this Spirit of God, that he *searcheth all things* <sup>a</sup> *yea the deep things of God*, and that there is no more hopes of *going from Gods Spirit* <sup>b</sup> than there is of *fleeing from his own presence*. Are *divine operations* another thing to know a divine person by? It is affirmed concerning this Spirit, that God *by it* <sup>c</sup> *garnished the heavens*, that he *made all the Host of them by this breath* <sup>d</sup> or Spirit of his mouth, and yet farther, that the *Spirit of God moved* <sup>e</sup> upon the face of that other part of the world, which was created *without form and void*. Which things I have contented my self thus briefly to admonish, not because they may not require some farther strengthening, considering what exceptions the Socinians have offer'd against them, but partly because I avoid as much as may be the doing of that again which is well enough <sup>f</sup> done already, and partly because I mean to insist a little upon the *divine honours*, that we find either given, or commanded to be given to the Holy Ghost, and other than which we shall not need, to shew this person to be divine.

<sup>f</sup> Pearson Expof.  
of the Creed.

It was a question that was sometime put by one *Schneider* to *Epi-scopus* <sup>g</sup>, upon occasion, as it seems, of an Apology written by the latter, whether there were any clear *precept* for, or *example* of the giving divine honours to the Holy Ghost. I meddle not at present with that example which he seemed to himself to have found, because I mean to give the preference at least to a text which the Church of God hath thought a good proof of his divinity, and from which I think I may as easily infer the giving honours to him as replenished with it: It is that, where our Saviour gave in charge to baptize in *his name* <sup>h</sup> as well as in that of the *Father* and the *Son*. For I demand first of all what is meant by *baptizing in* or *into the name* of those persons, into which the Apostles were commanded to baptize them? That a simple and naked washing was not intended, but on the contrary some acknowledgment thereby of those, into whose name they were to be baptiz'd; his commanding the Apostles to *make disciples* by so baptizing them may serve for an abundant evidence. For as the very mention of *baptizing into the name* of such and such doth, of it self, sufficiently evince their allying them near to them, whether by a participation of their benefits, or by acknowledging their authority, so the command of *making disciples* by so baptizing, their prompting men, by that ceremony of Baptism, to give up themselves as such to those into whose name they were baptiz'd, and own them as their Lords and masters. Whence it was, that, when some of the *Corinthians* had taken up with inferiour masters, and accordingly look'd no farther than them for the doctrines they embrac'd, St. Paul not only asks them whether they were *baptiz'd into the name* of those <sup>i</sup>, but makes it the matter of his *thanks* to God that he had *baptiz'd* but few of them, lest any should have taken occasion to say, that

<sup>g</sup> Vid. Prefant.  
ac Erudit. Viro-  
rum Epist. Eccl.  
& Theolog. pag.  
733.

<sup>h</sup> Mat. 28. 19.

<sup>i</sup> 1 Cor. 1. 13.  
&c.



that he had baptiz'd in his own name: Thereby plainly shewing, that to baptize, in the Christian sense, is to prompt men by that ceremony of Baptism to profess themselves disciples of those, whose name they were baptiz'd into. It appearing from the premises what is meant by baptizing into the name of the persons there commemorated, even to prompt them thereby to profess themselves disciples to them; we shall not belong to seek what kind of discipleship we are to profess, that is to say, whether not as well that which consists in giving obedience to their commands, as that which leads to learn of them, and give belief to what they teach. For beside that the very name of the *father*, requires another kind of discipleship, yea our Saviour doth every where require the giving obedience to him; beside that the same *Jesus* doth, immediately after this charge of his, require the teaching those Baptized persons to *observe all those things* that he himself had *commanded* them; It is evident from *St. Peter* that this *latter* was a signal part of that discipleship, whereof they made profession by their Baptism; he affirming<sup>k</sup> that Baptism to consist especially in the *Answer* or profession of a good conscience. Instead therefore of pursuing that any farther, I will enquire in the next place, what degree of discipleship is hereby profess'd, that is to say, whether such as belongs to some inferior matter, or such as is owing by us unto God. Though, even for the resolution of this, we shall not need to look any farther than the texts before alledged and the form of Baptism. For first of all it is evident from *St. Paul's* so carefully averting the charge of *baptizing into his own name*, that Baptism cannot be suppos'd to be made into the name of those, who (as the same *St. Paul* speaks<sup>l</sup>, and upon the same occasion) are *but ministers by whom we believe*, of what rank or dignity soever. Of which if no other use may be made, yet it may serve to remove a rub which the Socinians have laid in our way, the better to hinder our inferring from the command of baptizing into *his* name, either the divinity of the Holy Ghost, or giving divine honours to him. For with what reason, say they, can that be done, when we find by the same *St. Paul*<sup>m</sup> that the Israelites were *baptiz'd into Moses*,<sup>n</sup> 1 Cor. 10. 2. who was certainly no person in the God-head? But as, if they would have so much respect unto *St. Paul*, as to believe he would not so soon contradict himself, they would as soon have seen a necessity of quitting that sense which perswades the baptizing into the *name of Moses* (for what other was *Moses* in the Jewish Church, than a *minister by whom they believ'd*, as we do by the *ministry* of the Apostles?) so the scripture it self offers to us a sense of another nature, even the baptizing of those Israelites into that *religion* which God published by *him*. For thus the same *Moses*<sup>o</sup> is intitled to one of those Commandments which<sup>p</sup> Mark 7. 16 were written by the finger of God, and in which he had no farther interest, than the bringing to them those tables in which they were engrav'd. And indeed considering the thing the Apostle aims at in that *Chapter*, which is to shew by the miscarriage of some<sup>q</sup> of the Israelites, how<sup>r</sup> 1 Cor. 10. 3, 4. jealous we ought to be of our selves, notwithstanding our admission into a religion, which dispens'd Christ and his benefits by the means of Baptism and the Lords supper (for they who shall well weigh the *second, third* and *fourth* verses of that chapter will not find a more apt sense of them;) I see not how we can avoid the putting any other sense upon *baptizing into Moses*, than baptizing into that *religion* which he was made use of to publish. For what caution would their fall have been unto the Christians,

† Act. 19. 3.

— 4

stians, were it not that the Apostle intended to say, that even those Israelites were baptiz'd into a like glorious Religion with them, and which though not so clearly, did yet dispense the same Christ and his benefits? And yet after all God was *not well pleased with many of them*, yea testified his displeasure at them by many and fearful judgments: For otherwise that down-fall of the Israelites would have been a very frigid example, and such as could hardly have alarmed a Christian; as knowing that there was too great a difference between baptizing *into Moses* and *into Christ*, to make him think the benefits of the latter not to be a better amulet against Gods displeasure, than those which *Moses* could dispense unto his subjects. For less am I moved with that trifling objection out of the *Acts* <sup>P</sup> where we read of some persons being baptiz'd *into the Baptism of John*; for not one word is alledged by them to prove the baptizing into his *name*, or any other mortals. But as when it is apparent that *John* was the minister of that Baptism, it is not difficult to apprehend that nothing else may be meant by it, than their being baptiz'd into that Baptism, which *John* both perswaded and administred; so all that we can learn from what the Scripture hath elsewhere or there affirm'd concerning it is, that, though *John* did indeed baptize, yet it was only into *repentance* toward God <sup>9</sup> and *faith* toward him who was to come after him, even Christ Jesus. So that hitherto nothing appears, why we should think any Baptism, and much less that of Christ to have been made into any *other* name than what was also *divine*. And indeed, as *St. Paul* doth (by so carefully averting the imputation of *baptizing into his own name*, though one of the chief of the Apostles) make it probable that it is something more than humane into the name of which Christianity professeth to baptize; so *St. Peter* leads us more directly to the belief of a divinity in all those names, which men are *so*-consecrated to. For affirming concerning that Baptism, (of the manner of the administration whereof he could not be ignorant) that it was an *answer* or *profession of a good conscience towards God*, he makes the *principal* design at least of it to be the giving up themselves to God, and to that honour and obedience which is due unto him as such. Which (being compar'd with the enjoyn'd form of Baptism, and the no distinction that is there made as to the obedience that is there profess'd to the persons whose names are there commemorated) will put it past all doubt with reasonable men, that men are thereby prompted to look upon the Holy Ghost as God, and give him the honours that belong unto him as such. For when it is evident that Baptism is, principally at least, the profession of a good conscience toward God, when it is farther evident that no less than divine honour can be thought to be required by it toward the Father and the Son, whose divinity is so clearly asserted by the Scripture; with what face can any man deny the baptizing *in the name of the Holy Ghost* to be under the same condition, with those with whom he is indiscriminately conjoin'd? For where the law doth not distinguish, it is a rul'd case that the subjects thereof should not; how much less may they when it is so clear from other places of Scripture, that *two* of the *three* here mentioned have all that can be said to assure us, that they are really and truly divine. And were it not, that this notion of a Trinity of persons is so hard to be reconcil'd to the principles of meer reason (which yet is made more impracticable, than it really is, by some mens unwary conceptions or expressions of it) I no way doubt, they, who are now so loth to acknowledge it to be

be a part of *Scripture*, would both suddenly and easily be brought to see it *there*: But that therefore that I blame those *Separatists* in is, that, in case they cannot think fit to own the sober doctrine of the *Trinity*, they do not *honestly* renounce that religion which teacheth it, and adjoin themselves to some, which is more agreeable to their own reason. For to use such violence, as they do, to turn the Scriptures from their natural sense, which yet for the most part prevails no farther than to shew the words thereof to be capable of another (for how probable or not, they seldom allow themselves to consider;) This I say is a thing which is not to be pardon'd in them, and which I doubt they will far less approve to that one divine person whom they profess to own, than their rejection of the Scriptures altogether: Because though, as things may be represented to a mans mind, he may honestly enough reject that, which comes to him under the notion of a divine revelation, yet it cannot be thought other than an affront to God, to trifle with those things which a man professeth to own as his, and rather endeavour to bring them to his own sense, than his own sense to theirs. I have one thing farther to admonish as to the mysteries of the Gospel, and which I know not where better to place than here; and that is to consider, what *Assent* it is that the Scripture requires, even such as hath not only the name and nature of *Faith* but of a *rewardable* one. For as that is an assent which rests only upon the revelations of God, and which therefore, if we find not to be wanting, our assent is to follow of course; so there is no reason to expect the revelation should be so clear as not to be encumbered with any doubt. It may be enough that it is so clear, that we have more reason to assent to the matter of it, than we have to withdraw our assent from it: Partly because we cannot think the good and gracious God would have given even such a one, if he meant not to call our minds to the acknowledgment of it, and partly because our faith would not otherwise be so rewardable, as we have reason to believe it was intended to be; To assent, where there is not any appearance of a doubt, being not *virtue* but *necessity*, not the *obedience of faith* (as the Scripture speaks) but its unavoidable burthen. Rom. 16. 26.

But to return to that from which I have diverted, and shew yet farther that we are not without proofs of giving divine honours to the Holy Ghost. In order whereunto I will in the next place alledge that very well known prayer or benediction of St. Paul<sup>i</sup>, and which the Christian<sup>c</sup> Church hath taken up after him to dismiss their assemblies with, *The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all, Amen.* 2 Cor. 13. 14. That this benevolent wish of St. Paul is a true and proper prayer I shall take for granted, because no man can be so fond as to think that he, who wish'd so well to his *Corinthians*, and knew from whence and by what means *every good and perfect gift* is to be fetch'd, would content himself with an idle and inefficacious *velicity*. But neither shall I stand to shew, that he pray'd to God the Father for his love towards them, nor yet (after the proofs I have given of his Divinity, and of the divine honours that have been paid him, even with the command of the Scripture) that he pray'd to the Lord Jesus Christ for his grace or favour. The only thing that can fall into question is, whether he address'd himself to the Holy Ghost for that *communion* or *communication* rather which he here wisheth to his beloved *Corinthians*. Though why this should be made a question among



mong sober and unprejudiced men, I must confess my self unable to understand. For when it cannot be deny'd, that the other two boons, that are desir'd, are beg'd of those *two* persons to whom they are respectively attributed; What should hinder us from thinking that the *communion of the Holy Ghost* is desir'd of him also, as well as either *love* or *grace* of the *other*? Especially when it is expressly affirm'd concerning this Holy Ghost, that he *divideth* of his benefits *severally as he will*. For if we are not lightly to distinguish where the Scripture and St. Paul hath not, how much less, when it doth appear that that *communion*, or communication, which is desir'd, belongs to a *free* Agent, and he therefore as reasonably and necessarily implor'd to make his will propitious to us? I think I shall not need to add, or only briefly admonish, that if a prayer be here made to the Holy Ghost, it ought to be accounted of the same nature with that which is made to God and Christ, and so no other than such a prayer as is a certain part of Divine Adoration: Partly because (as was before noted) no distinction is made as to this particular by St. Paul, and we therefore not without great reason to do it; and partly, because that *communion* (or *communication* rather) which is here desir'd of the Holy Ghost is a more clear proof of the Holy Ghost's divinity, than any other that can be alledged; That *communion*, or *communication*, whereof we speak, being principally conversant about the hearts of men, and consequently not advantageously perform'd without a knowledge of the particular necessities of mens hearts (which is one great prerogative of the Divine Nature) and a power to change those hearts which is another. So easie is it to see, if men are dispos'd to do it, that the Scripture is not without good proofs of giving divine honours to the Holy Ghost; and then we shall not only find reason for that *Glory* which the Church hath thought fit to give *him* in common with the *Father* and the *Son*, but be oblig'd by that and the foremention'd arguments to look upon him as a person, yea a truly divine one, which is that which was to be demonstrated by us. I say nothing at all either of this Holy Ghost's being a *distinct* person from that of the Father and the Son, or of his being the *third* person in the Trinity, how necessary soever that may seem to complete our account of his nature: Because the *former* of these is sufficiently evident from the Scriptures distinguishing him from both the other in the form of Baptism and the forementioned Benediction of St. Paul; as both the *one* and the *other*, from the account I shall give of the persons *from whom* he derives this so glorious a being of his, the next thing in order to be enquir'd into.

II. For the resolution whereof I will first of all insist upon the evidence there is of the Holy Ghost's deriving this his being from the Father, and then of deriving it also from the Son. Of the former of these we have as much assurance as either the doctrine of the Scripture, or the reasonings of our own minds upon what is there affirm'd can give us. For not only is he entitled the *Spirit of God*, and particularly *of the father*, which how he should be if he did not derive his essence from him cannot be understood; but affirmed to be *of God*, and to *proceed from him*. Words which have been constantly believ'd to denote that his *eternal* procession from him, and indeed cannot be understood of that temporal one by which he is affirmed to have come into the world from him; because he was entitled the *Spirit of God* long before that time, and not only so, but was made use of by God in the *garnishing the heavens*, and digesting

\* Mat. 10. 20.  
comp. with  
Joh. 20. 17.  
\* 1 Cor. 2. 11,  
12.  
† John 15. 26.

gesting that *Chaos* in which the other parts of the world were blended. Not unlike is the evidence we have from the reasonings of our own minds, and which, however they may be prescrib'd against where they have no such foundation to build upon, yet cannot be refus'd; where they proceed upon the affirmations of Scripture. For this latter giving us to understand that he was *sent by the father*<sup>2</sup>, yea receiv'd *intimations*<sup>2</sup> Joh. 14. 26. from him<sup>2</sup> of what he was to deliver unto the world, it is but reason to believe that he deriv'd his being from him, because it cannot otherwise appear what right there was in the Father to send him, and much less of dictating to him what he should speak when he came into it. And though the Scripture doth not afford the like proofs of the Holy Ghost's deriving his essence from the Son; though, where it speaks in one place of this affair under the term of *procession*, it takes notice only of his *proceeding from the father*, neither was any more set down in the *Constantinopolitan Creed* till the *Latin Church* made an addition to it; yet there is enough in the Scripture to shew his deriving his essence from the Son, and nothing at all in that peculiar expression of *proceeding from the father* to exclude it. For first this Spirit of God is also expressly stiled the *Spirit of Christ*<sup>3</sup>, which, beside the common interest it denotes Christ to have in him, and of which no account can be given but from the deriving of his essence from him, hath this farther force to prove it: To wit, that the Holy Ghost had the particular title of *spirit*, not upon the account of the *spirituality* of his nature which is common to the other persons with him, but of the relation he bears to them, or at least to one of them, and the manner of receiving his essence from him. Witness the titles whereby the other two persons are commonly known both in the Scripture and the Creed, and the language of the same Scripture concerning that Holy Ghost of whom we are discoursing. For as the first person hath the title of *father* upon the account of his relation to the second, and that essence which he communicated to him by *generation*, so the second hath the title of *Son* because of his receiving his divine nature by *generation* from the first; and why not then the Holy Ghost the title of *Ghost* or *Spirit*, because of his receiving his essence by *spiration* or something analogical to it? Conformable hereto is the language of the Scripture, and after which we cannot well doubt of this being the true original of that title, by which the Spirit of God is known and distinguished from the rest. For what *Job*<sup>4</sup> expresseth by Gods *garnishing the heavens by his Spirit*, the *Psalmist*<sup>5</sup> Job 26. 13. expresseth by his *making them by the breath or spirit of his mouth*; <sup>6</sup> Psalm 33. 6. plainly intimating thereby, that he was as it were the breath of the mouth of God, or rather receiv'd his essence by the breathing of it. Now forasmuch as this Spirit whereof we speak had therefore the title of *spirit* of God, because he receiv'd his essence from him, it is but reason to believe (because he is also entitled the *Spirit of Christ*) that he receiv'd his essence too from him, and after the same manner, or rather by the common *spiration* of them both. But then if we moreover add his being *sent by the*<sup>7</sup> Joh. 16. 7. *Son, taking*<sup>8</sup> of his as well as Gods, and also *glorifying him*, so we cannot well doubt of the Holy Ghosts receiving his essence from the Son, any more than of his receiving it from the Father; There appearing not any congruity at all in the Sons *sending* of him, and *imparting* to him, unless he communicated to him his essence also. The only difficulty in this affair is our Saviours taking notice only of his *proceeding from the father*, even where he is confessed to speak of his *eternal one*; and the *Constantinopolitan*

*tinopolitan* Creed's contenting it self with that only account of it, though it is not at all sparing in describing that divine person to us. But beside that our Saviour, though he take notice only of his *proceeding from the father*, yet doth not deny the proceeding of him from himself, but (if that whole verse be considered) implies it rather by affirming<sup>b</sup> that he would send him from the Father; there might possibly be something in that expression to denote his proceeding from the Father as the *primo-prime* fountain of his being, and for which therefore he avoided to apply it unto himself. For not much unlike doth the Scripture discourse, when speaking of the Father's being the Fountain of all created beings, it makes use of a particular phrase (and which is not much unlike this) to express his interest in it, even that *of him are all things and we in him*<sup>i</sup>, whereas it denotes the interest of the Son by this, that *by him are all things, and we by him*. And though I will not be so positive in affirming that this was the only reason why the *Constantinopolitan* Fathers confin'd this *proceeding from* unto the Father, because they have no other words to express his proceeding from the Son, though in another manner; yet I am apt to think it had some influence upon it: Because (as a *Learned man*<sup>k</sup> hath very pertinently observ'd) the *Ancient Greeks*, or at least some of them, allowed the being of the Holy Ghost from the Son as well as from the Father, but expressed that his being from the Son by *receiving of him* at the same time they express'd his being from the Father by *proceeding from him*. However, if that may not be thought an answer perfectly satisfactory, considering that the *Constantinopolitan* Creed makes no mention at all of his being from the Son in any manner; yet there is place for saying, that it being not so clear from the Scriptures that the Holy Ghost derives his being from the Son, as there is that he deriv'd it from the Father; the Compilers of that *Creed* contented themselves with affirming that he *proceeded from the father*; in the mean time neither denying nor affirming his being from the Son at all, but leaving men (as in a point less clear) to their own reason and judgment, and that information which the Scriptures gave concerning it. And had the succeeding ages contented themselves with the same moderation, it might have been better for the Church, but however that fatal Schism might have been prevented, which arose between the *Greek* and *Latin* Church by occasion of the latters adding to the Creed the Holy Ghosts *proceeding from the Son* also. Only as nothing hinders the propugning of a truth, which seems to me to have so good a foundation in the Scripture, so the term of *proceeding from the Son* may be look'd upon so much the more favourably, because the intendment thereof, in the sense of the *Latin* Church, is no other than the being of the Holy Ghost from him, without specifying at all the manner after which he deriv'd his divine essence from him. I will dismiss this argument, when I have reflected upon an allegation of *Cyril* the late Patriarch of *Alexandria* in his Epistle<sup>l</sup> to *John Vyttenbo-gaert*, and so much the rather because I find it hath been thought to be of force by more unprejudiced men. For among other things by him al-  
 ledged for the present faith of the *Greeks*, he insists upon it as a thing no way conceivable, how two distinct *hypostases* should concur to the producing of the same numerical action and effect. But beside that such arguments are of no value against more immediate deductions from Scripture, especially in a matter of this nature (for who can give an account either to his own mind, or that of others, of the Father's communicating his own

<sup>b</sup> Joh. 15. 26.

<sup>i</sup> 1 Cor. 8. 6.

<sup>k</sup> Pearson Ex-  
 pos. of the Creed,  
 pag. 648. edit.  
 4.

<sup>l</sup> Vid. Praesent.  
 ac Erudit. Vi-  
 rorum Epistol.  
 Ecclesiast. &  
 Theol. pag. 403.



own divine nature to the Son and Holy Ghost, which yet the Scripture obligeth us to believe?) Supposing, as we may, and as I think I have before shewn, that one of these *hypostases* acts with some subordination to the other, that difficulty will appear far less than it doth, if yet it do not perfectly vanish. Because so, though distinct *hypostases*, they will be but as *one principle* to that operation to which they concur.

III. I have done (and am not sorry that I have so) with a very ticklish argument, and wherein I had rather hear *others* discourse than *my self*, and much rather *admire* and *adore* that Holy Ghost who is the subject of it, than *either*; I come now, according to my proposed method, to consider of his *office*, or at least as to that *Holiness* from which he is here denominated. For though the Spirit of God may be termed *holy* because *such* in his own nature, or to distinguish him from *unclean* and *unholy* Spirits; yet because both in the *Creed* and in the *Scripture* he is not distinguish'd by the title of *Holy Ghost* from *unclean* and *unholy* Spirits, but from the *Father* and the *Son*, who are equally holy with himself, and the Communication of that *Holiness*, from which he receives his name, is in the *Scripture* peculiarly attributed unto him, therefore it is but requisite to understand by *Holy* his making us *such*, his communicating of that excellent quality unto others. Taking it therefore for granted, that that is the thing here intended, and not his own intrinsic holiness, I will, for the due elucidation of it, enquire,

1. What evidence there is from the *Scripture* of his being thus Holy, or rather the Author of all that is such in us.
  2. To whom he imparts of this Holiness, and so much the rather because that Catechism, which I am to explain, restrains<sup>m</sup> it to the Catechumen and Gods elect.
  3. How all this is consistent with the liberty of our own will, and those many precepts and exhortations which prompt us both to procure and exercise it.
1. Now there are two things which are necessary to beget holiness in us, and which consequently must be prov'd concerning the holy Ghost, if we make him the Author of it, first the *enlightning* of our dark *understandings*, and secondly the *renewing* of our depraved *will*s and *affections*. For as no man can be duly affected with that which he knows not, and consequently neither with a holy life, if he have not first a due apprehension both of it and of its excellency; so neither, though he have a due apprehension of them both, if his heart be estranged from it (as it is certain all ours are) without implanting contrary affections in it.

*Thirdly, in God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me, and all the elect people of God. Answer to that question of the Church-Catechism. What dost thou chiefly learn in the Articles of thy belief?*

1. To begin with the former of these, even the *enlightning* of our *understandings*, where again these two things would be considered, whether or no, and how far the Holy Ghost contributes toward the clearing of that which they are to know; and whether or no and how far it contributes toward the rectifying or strengthening of their apprehensions concerning that holiness which is to be the object of them.

It is commonly thought, because of the reasonableness of holiness, and the approbation it receives from the reasonings of our own minds after they come to be enlightened by the doctrine of the *Scripture*, that if we do not now owe our understanding of it to the dictates of our own minds, yet we might, if we had been advertant enough, have fetch'd the knowledge thereof from thence, and so have superseded the derivation of it from the assistance of that Spirit who is represented as our informer

and sanctifier. But as they who come thus prepossess'd by the illuminations of Christianity, are no very competent judges how far their own reason unassisted would have serv'd them for this discovery, so they consider not at all in what condition the Holy Ghost found the world, when he began to display that most wholſom doctrine which men have since imbib'd. For had they done ſo, they would not only have look'd upon it as a thing extremely *difficult*, but *morally* at least *impoſſible* to have underſtood the due nature of holineſs without thoſe his celeſtial aſſiſtances. For was not even that part of the world, which had the doctrine of the *Old Teſtament* to inform it, overrun with many errors, and ſuch too which we our ſelves cannot but wonder at, conſidering the nature of thoſe things about which thoſe their errors were converſant? Were they not come to that paſs, through the deprav'd *traditions* of their Fathers, as to place all their holineſs in external actions, yea to place it in a clean attire, waſhen hands, and the circumciſion of their fleſh? Nay were they not ſo far debauch'd, as to err even about the external actions of Religion, and think the dedicating of their ſubſtance to God, or the pronouncing it only as ſuch \*, might excuſe them from ſo neceſſary a duty, as the contributing to their diſtreſſed parents aſſiſtance? Was not the caſe yet far worſe with the Gentile world, and which indeed was a *world* it ſelf in compariſon of that handful of men which the land of *Jury* contain'd? Were they not overrun with groſs and abſurd conceits concerning that Divine Nature which is the principal object of holineſs? Were they not come to *deſiſe* any thing which their forefathers had prompted them to, or they themſelves apprehended any the leaſt advantage by? In ſine were they not as much deprav'd in their conceptions concerning thoſe things which were due from them to one another? Was not their juſtice, (ſuch as they had yet remaining) ſhut up within the bounds of their own Commonwealth, did they not think themſelves priviledg'd to ſeize upon any thing of thoſe who were ſtrangers to it, provided they kept themſelves from preying upon thoſe of their own Nation and Polity? Things ſtanding thus with the world, as it is apparant that they did, when the Holy Ghost was ſent to enlighten as well as ſanctifie it, let any man of reaſon judge, whether *morally* ſpeaking any perſon could have attain'd a due knowledge of holineſs if this Spirit whereof we ſpeak had not become his Informer. For men naturally following the conduct of thoſe with whom they converſe, but however ſure to be prepoſſeſs'd by their ill inſtructions and ill example, it is eaſie to ſee, that, how ſincere ſoever ſome of them might have been in their enquiries, and how perſpicacious ſoever in their apprehenſions, yet thoſe evil prepoſſeſſions they had met with would have very much corrupted their notions, if ſome *δὲ δὲ μὴ αὐτὸν* had not ſtep'd in to their aſſiſtance. Of which yet if what hath been ſaid may not paſs for a ſufficient proof, let men but caſt their eye upon *Socrates* the glory of the heathen world, and who had the courage to die for the great Lord and governour of it. For even of him it was obſerv'd by *Tertullian* †, as long before that father by *Plato*, who was a more favourable eſtimator of his actions, that he was not without a tang of that *Polytheiſm* which he died for decrying: This latter affirming of him ‡ that when the poyſon was brought him, he ask'd leave to pour out ſome of it as a *drink-offering* to the Gods for his happy departure out of this world, and after he had drank it, yea even when he was now expiring, gave order for the ſacrificing of a *Cock* to *Aſculapius*, as a tribute

\* Mat. 15. 5, 6.

† De anima. c. 1.

‡ Plato in Phæd. ſeſ. 49. ed. Cantabrig.

tribute which he ow'd him, I suppose for preserving his life hitherto. Such reason had *Tertullian* to ask, even upon the score of that one instance, *by whom hath the truth been ever found out without God, to whom hath God been known without the assistance of Christ, or Christ without that of the Holy Ghost?* For here, if any where, one might have expected a clear understanding concerning that God who is the principal object of holiness. But (as the same *Tertullian* goes on) *the documents of the Christian power had not as yet appeared, which alone is able to lead in triumph that most pernicious power, and never good, which was the framer of Ancient error, and that which takes men off from all truth.* And though there be in some of the discourses of the heathen many glorious notions concerning holiness and vertue (though whether even they were wholly owing to the pure dictates of their minds, when *Socrates* doth so solemnly and constantly vouch the presence of a supernatural power to him, may very well be made a question) yet they who shall consider what reason there is to believe some of the Ancients heathen to have borrowed much from the *Jews* and their writings, as in like manner how much even the morals of the heathen were clear'd up after *Christianity* came into the world, will think it no way improbable, that they did either mediately or immediately owe much of what they knew to that Holy Ghost, by whom the Writers both of the Old and New Testament were inspir'd. Such reason is there to believe, how apprehensive soever we may suppose the minds of men to be, that had it not been for the first informations of them by the Holy Ghost in the Apostles, they would rather have improv'd in their Ancient errors, than come to have discarded them: And they who shall consider how prone the minds of men are to error, what little leisure the generality of men have to look into the sacred writings, and how unapt for the apprehending of them, will as easily be brought to acknowledge, that men would soon have relaps'd into their pristine follies, had not the same Holy Ghost, who inspir'd the Apostles, both given order for and continued a succession of Pastours for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ. Thus far therefore we have already gone toward the clearing of that sanctifying power which is by the Creed and the Scripture attributed to the Holy Ghost, that had it not been for his assistance and the continuance of it, men could not have come so far toward the embracing of holiness as to have been able to attain a due understanding of its nature, how strong soever or capacious we may suppose their apprehensions to have been.

But because it hath been thought, and accordingly maintain'd by the Church against *Pelagius*, that the Holy Ghost doth not only clear the object to our minds, but clear also our understandings in the apprehension of it, therefore it will be but necessary to make that also the subject of our enquiry, thereby to shew yet more fully how he concurs to our illumination. And indeed if either the Scripture or reason may be Judge, we shall find this to be a part of the assistance the Holy Ghost affords us, yea a necessary one: As will appear, if we consider the nature of some of the things to be known in order to the understanding of an Evangelical holiness, or the prejudices we have against much of that which is called such. In the number of the former of these I reckon the doctrine of the

<sup>1</sup> *Tert. ubi supra. Cui enim veritas comperta sine Deo? cui Deus cognitus sine Christo? cui Christus exploratus sine spiritu sancto?*

<sup>2</sup> *Tert. ibid. Nondum enim Christiane potestatis documenta processerant, quae vim istam perniciosissimam, nec unquam bonam, antiqui erroris artificem, omnis veritatis avocatricem sola traducit.*

<sup>3</sup> *Plato. in Apol. Socrat. Sect. 13.*



\* 1 Cor. 2. 14.

Trinity, and the obligations that doctrine lays upon us to proportion our holiness to the several persons of it. For being these are not only above the comprehension of our understandings, but so far as we are able to judge, repugnant to the natural dictates of them; it was but necessary that our understandings should be first suited to them, and rais'd as much above themselves, as the things we are to know are: All perception requiring a correspondency between the object and that faculty which is to judge of it. But so St. Paul hath taught us to reason, which is certainly a far better proof of it, than any our own understanding can suggest; he affirming that *the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God, because they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discern'd.* For what place can there be for supposing that an illumination of the object is enough, when the reason assign'd of mens natural inability to discern the things of God, is not only upon the account of their repugnancy to the dictates of their minds, but upon the necessity there is of their being *spiritually* discern'd, which is a faculty the natural man is without. And though to us, who have been long reconcil'd to such things as these, there may seem force enough in the *revelations* of God to perswade and extort an assent to the matter of them, how unaccountable soever to the dictates of our own minds; yet is it for want of considering how far the *spirit of God* may have contributed to our own assent (as to be sure, if it be a well radicated and efficacious one, it hath) and the force there is in prejudice to hinder men from assenting to things that lie open enough to their reason. For if prejudice will stave men off from assenting unto things, that may otherwise be reasonably enough believ'd, how much more may we think that prejudice will (unless the mind, wherein it is, be more than ordinarily enlightned) which is made up of the best dictates the mind of man can afford him, as certainly that prejudice is, which men naturally have against their believing *one and the same nature* to subsist in *three several and distinct persons.* And here very opportunely comes in the consideration of those other prejudices the mind of man hath *in some measure* against all that is called holy, and to the removal whereof therefore we may well think a special enlightning of the mind to be but necessary. For let the object in it self be never so suitable to the understanding, let it be propos'd with the greatest clearness and conviction; yet if the mind of man be prejudic'd against it, it shall resist the force of it, and be as far from being convinc'd thereof, as if it were incapable of apprehending it. For as there is no eye so blind as that which will not see, so neither any understanding so dull as that which is not willing to apprehend those truths which are propos'd to it. Now forasmuch as through the corruption of our wills and affections there is the like corruption in our understandings, and our minds are prejudic'd against those things which we have no list to practise, let any man believe, that can, that those prejudices will ever be so far surmounted without a supernatural illumination, as to prompt men so to assent to unpleasant truths as to be perswaded into the practice of them, which is the assent whereof we now speak, and to the producing whereof we affirm the illumination of God to be necessary. For as for a meer notional and inefficacious assent, I will not deny but a far less illumination may produce it, yea it may be only a clear proposal of the thing to be assented to; Though even that would hardly have been obtain'd at *first* by that way which the Gospel took to compass it, without

without somewhat of that illumination whereof I speak : Because however men may submit to the force of reason, yet *ipse dixit* is a thing men are not willing to be captivated by, neither are they easily born down, especially against their own lusts and interests, by the meer Authority of their instructors, how well soever that Authority may be confirmed to them. Of which to omit other proofs (as what necessity is there of other ?) we have those very men for a witness, to whom that gospel was first preach'd, which we affirm not to be assented to without an illumination from above. For how agreeable soever it was in many things to their own reason and conscience, and how well soever witnessed to by miracles, yet the delivering it to the world upon the Authority of him that promulg'd it, prejudic'd men as much against it as the uncouthness of many of its doctrines, and its way of *preaching* was thought as great a folly <sup>1</sup> as any paradox it maintain'd.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. 1. 21.

2. An account being thus given of the Holy Ghosts *enlightning our understandings*, and so bringing us so far at least to the espousing of that holiness which is enjoin'd upon us, enquire we in the next place whether he do not also *dispose our wills and affections* to it, and so make himself yet more the *Author* of all that Holiness which is in us. For the evidencing whereof I will first of all alledge such texts of Scripture as attribute the work of Sanctification to him. For being holiness and vertue have their principal seat in the will and affections, and are from thence deriv'd to our operations, if it may appear from the Scripture that he makes us Holy as well as brings us to the understanding of that which is so, it will also follow that our wills and affections are influenced by him in this affair, neither are we more indebted to him for the understanding we have of holiness, than for our own propension and inclination to it. Now that the Holy Ghost doth *sanctifie or make us holy*, as well as bring us to understand what is really such, is evident from several places of Scripture. For thus St. Paul tells us in one place <sup>1</sup>, that *the offering of the Gentiles*, or rather those Gentiles which that great Apostle of theirs offered unto God, became *acceptable unto him by being sanctified by the Holy Ghost* ; as elsewhere <sup>2</sup>, that God had *chosen those* he wrote to *through sanctification of the Spirit*. In fine, thus St. Peter <sup>3</sup> tells those *strangers* to whom he address'd that Epistle of his, that as they were *elect according to the foreknowledge of the father*, so also *through the sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience*. Which last text I so place, because giving us clearly to understand, what the nature of this sanctification is, even the making us obedient to Gods will. For though the word sanctification do not always signifie to make holy, as being sometime taken for the giving such honour to holy things as that Holiness of theirs requires, or setting things aside to holy uses ; yet being to make holy is the proper signification of the word *sanctifie*, being man is capable of becoming so, being our sanctification is said to be *unto obedience*, and elsewhere express'd by the *renewing* <sup>4</sup> of the Holy Ghost, as that renewing affirm'd to consist <sup>5</sup> in *creating us in righteousness and true holiness* ; for these reasons I say it is but necessary to understand by sanctification of the Holy Ghost, the making us such after his own blessed example. But not to suffer so great a truth to rest upon a word which is acknowledg'd by our selves to be capable of some other sense, than which is here attributed to it, I shall alledge in the next place that Spirit of God's working in us that will and affections we have for those things that are pleasing in his sight. For thus

<sup>1</sup> Rom. 15. 16.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Thes. 2. 13.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Pet. 1. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Tit. 3. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Eph. 4. 24.

for the *former* of these we are told by St. Paul, even where he enjoins us to *work out our own salvation* (which we all know to be by holiness and virtue) that it is God *that worketh in us to <sup>a</sup> will and to do of his good pleasure*, that is to say (as the foregoing texts perswade, and the general tenour of the Scripture) through the sanctification of his Spirit: As <sup>b</sup> Gal. 5. 22, 23. for the latter by the same Apostle <sup>b</sup>, that those divine qualities of *love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance*, are the *fruit of the Spirit*, yea as certainly and truly such, as *adultery and fornication* can be supposed to be <sup>c</sup> of the *flesh*. Which who can read and not believe that we owe the right disposition of our wills and affections to him, as well as the clearing of our understandings.

3. I may not omit to add (though not before taken notice of by me) that we have a particular obligation to the Holy Ghost for the holiness of our *actions*, beside that which doth arise from the sanctification of our *wills* and *affections*. Otherwise it had not only been no way necessary, but (so far as we are able to judge) superfluous also for the Scripture to say, that God worketh in us *to do* <sup>d</sup> as well as *to will* of his good pleasure: Gods working in us *to will* being so the whole of his operation, but however necessarily inferring the production of the other: And indeed he that shall consider *on the one hand* the imperfect sanctification of our wills, and *on the other hand* the remains of corruption which that imperfect sanctification supposeth, and the place that corruption leaves to temptations to enter in and triumph over us, will readily subscribe to the truth of what I affirm. For being by the former supposition so imperfectly sanctified and guarded within, it is easie to see that, did not the Holy Ghost concur also to the sanctification of our actions, the operations that flow from our wills would be very uncertain, because in so much danger both from within and without to be depriv'd of that holiness which is due unto them.

Now though from what hath been said it be competently evident, that we owe all the Holiness we have to that Spirit of God in whom we are here call'd upon to believe; yet because question hath been sometime made concerning his being the Author of the *first beginnings* of our holiness, and may as well be concerning his *continuing* us in or the *consummation* of it, I will make it my business to shew that he is the beginner, continuer, and perfecter of all that holiness, wherewith the Sons of men are endu'd.

I alledge for the first of these that known saying of St. Paul, where he <sup>e</sup> 1 Cor. 12. 13. affirms, that *we are all baptiz'd by this one Spirit into one body*, even into that of which Christ Jesus is head. For being baptism is the ceremony of our initiation or entrance into the body of Christ out of which no true holiness is, and the effect or rather efficacy of baptism is here attributed to the Spirit, it follows that our initiation into the body of Christ is by him, and consequently the first beginnings also of our holiness. The same is yet more evident from those places of Scripture which express this initiation of ours under the metaphor of a new birth or renovation, such as that in particular is which records our Saviours Answer to *Nicodemus* when he demanded of him *how a man could be born again* <sup>f</sup>. *Verily verily I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*. For since nothing can be said to be antecedent to its birth, at least as to that essence in which it is born; if we may be said, as we are, to be born of the Spirit, we must acknowledge our



our first being to him, that we owe our conversion unto God, and first holiness to him. Thus much I say is evident from the outside of the *Metaphor*, to which our spiritual being is compar'd; how much more may we suppose it will be, if we do more nearly consider what it is to be born, and the perfect ineptitude of those things, that are to contribute to their own production. For as to be born to any being doth suppose a want of that being before their birth, and consequently of all holiness in us before we are thus spiritually born; so it excludes at least from the thing born the contributing any thing to its own production, otherwise than as influenced by those causes by which it is produc'd. Otherwise a thing might be said to give a being to it self, and the Child be in some measure the Parent of it self as well as the Father that begat him. Only if it should be repli'd, that this metaphor of a new birth is no farther to be press'd than the Scripture that makes use of it doth lead the way; and much less when the thing intended under it hath other resemblances made use of to describe it; I answer, that *that* is indeed true, but makes nothing at all against us, or the inference that is made there-from by us: Because the Scripture it self prompts us to the making of it, neither do those other resemblances in any measure contradict it, but rather confirm and establish it. For to begin with the metaphor before insisted on, and which we must of necessity allow to carry in it a resemblance of that thing which is describ'd under it; Who is there that sees not, that it is not only entitled a new birth in respect of the great change that is made in the thing born, but also in respect of the producers of it? Our Saviour affirming as well that we must be *born of Gods Spirit*, and his instrument *water*, as that we must be *born* at all. For that suppos'd, the production of this birth must be entitled to him and him alone; and therefore no inconvenience for us to urge, even from that metaphor, the not concurring of the thing born to its own birth, any otherwise than as influenced by those things by which it is affirmed to be begotten. But then if we moreover consider, how frequently and clearly the Scripture attributes the work of sanctification to this Spirit of God; if we consider farther that the same Scripture represents him as working in us both *to will and to do*, yea makes him the parent even of those good *thoughts* we conceive; So we shall see yet more reason to press that new birth to the excluding of the thing born from any other way contributing to its birth, than as it is influenc'd by him of whom it is said to be born, and to whom therefore the whole efficacy of it must be ascrib'd. For what less do those Scriptures say, which affirm that we cannot go so far by our own ability toward it, as to entertain one good and allowable thought? And though it be true that the Scripture makes use of other expressions, such as those of a *creation*, *resurrection*, *renovation* and the like; Yet as the two former of these do rather confirm than overthrow the foremention'd inference, because excluding the party either created or rais'd from having any efficacy in that great work which is wrought upon him, so that of a *renovation* is no way inferiour to it, if we will suffer the Scripture to interpret it. For however that may be sometime appli'd to productions of an inferiour nature than that of a birth may seem to be, yet can we not so understand it; when he, who speaks of our being thus renew'd, adds in one place that it is such a renovation<sup>a</sup> Eph. 4. 23, 24. as produceth a *new man*, and one *who after God is created in righteousness and true holiness*, as in another<sup>b</sup>, that, by the vertue of it, not only<sup>c</sup> Col. 3. 10. a *new man* is form'd, but such a new man as is *after the image of him that created*

created him. For these and such like expressions do add yet more weight to the belief of such a new birth, as excludes the person born from contributing any other way thereto than as influenced by its proper parent. I cannot think that I can ever too much clear this assertion, and therefore I will be yet more particular. It is sufficiently known and frequently intimated in the Scripture, that there are in every conversion or regeneration these two things, an aversion from sin and impiety, and a conversion to God and holiness; the former represented by the *mortification of the Old man*, the latter by *putting on the new one*. To make it therefore evident that our entrance upon the State of grace and holiness is the effect of the Holy Ghost, I will take each of these by themselves, and shew them to be the fruits and effects of Gods spirit. I alledge for the former of these that well known saying of St. Paul, though I am not ignorant that it speaks of such a *mortification*, as is consequent to our new birth and conversion.

<sup>1</sup> Rom. 8. 13.

For if ye, saith that Apostle <sup>1</sup>, *live after the flesh ye shall die, but if ye through the Spirit mortify the deeds of the body ye shall live*. For if that latter mortification be owing to the efficacy of Gods spirit, how much more that which is antecedent to it, and which finds us under a greater inability for it? And indeed setting aside our long acquaintance with the *Old man*, and that kindness which is wont to arise from such an acquaintance, how is it possible for humane nature to shake him off, supposing it to be so dispos'd? It being not the least commendation of grace, which such a man is supposed to be without, to eject an enemy out of his habitation. The same is no less evident of our conversion to God, or rather of that part of it whereby we become new men; witness not only all those texts that attribute our Spiritual birth unto this Spirit, but that yet more clear one of St. Paul <sup>1</sup>, where he tells us that *we are saved by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost*. For this shews that it is he who makes us to be what we now are, as well as cease to be what we sometime were.

<sup>1</sup> Tit. 3. 5.

That we owe to this Holy Ghost the first beginnings of our holiness hath been at large declar'd, and man so far forth cut off from *glorying in any but in the Lord*; enquire we now whether our continuance in that state be not also to be ascribed to him by whom we were first converted and born. Which that it is, will need no other evidence than the promise

<sup>1</sup> Joh. 14. 16,

<sup>17.</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. 3. 16.

which was sometime made by our Saviour <sup>m</sup>, and afterwards <sup>n</sup> confirm'd by the event, of this Holy Spirits *abiding* or *dwelling* in and with us. For to what purpose that abiding or dwelling, but that the continuance of his presence and influence is as necessary to keep us in the state of grace, as it was to bring us into it? Only if it should be said that that abiding may be for other ends, and therefore not with any regard to the continuing of us in that holiness which he sometime bestow'd upon us, it will not be difficult to take off that evasion by St. Pauls <sup>o</sup> alledging this Spirit of God to  *dwell in us* as in a *temple*, as that again to replenish us with the *holiness* of one. For that shews the holiness we speak of to be the end of his continuing in us, and (because we are not to think that continuing is without cause) that we owe the continuance of our own holiness to it. Lastly forasmuch as the same St. Paul writing to the *Corinthians*, whom in the beginning <sup>p</sup> he stiles by the name of *Saints*, as in the latter end <sup>q</sup> by the name of *brethren*, doth yet in the close of it after his exhorting them to be perfect, pray <sup>r</sup> that the *communion* or *communication of the Holy Ghost* might be with them, he plainly shews (for otherwise

<sup>r</sup> 2 Cor. 1. 1.

<sup>1</sup> — 13. 11.

<sup>1</sup> — 14.

otherwise

otherwise that prayer of his had been unnecessary) that their continuance in holiness, as well as their entrance upon it, depended upon the continuance of his influences.

In fine as our entrance upon, and continuance in holiness is owing to his Grace, so that the consummation thereof is, the same St. Paul sufficiently intimates, where he professeth himself to be *confident* that he *who had begun a good work* in his Philippians *would perform, or rather* <sup>Phil. 1. 6.</sup> *finish it, until the day of the Lord Jesus.*

2. It appearing from the premises what evidence there is from the Scripture of the Holy Ghosts being the Author of all that is holy in us, enquire we in the next place to *whom he imparts of this holiness*, and so much the rather, because that *Catechism*, which I am to explain, restrains it to the *Catechumen* and Gods *elect*. And indeed as it is too apparant that he imparts not of this Holiness unto all, but however not to those of the Gentile world, so it seems to me equally apparant that he imparts of it to those, to whom our *Catechism* teacheth us to ascribe it: To the *Catechumen*, because supposing him to be baptiz'd, and so born again of water and the Holy Ghost; as in like manner to *all the elect people of God*, whether thereby we understand (as the *seventeenth Article* of our Church understands the word) those whom God hath constantly decreed to deliver from damnation; or whether (as I rather think, and what follows concerning the *Holy Catholick Church* perswades) those whom he hath vouchsaf'd the singular privilege of being made members of the Church by the same Baptismal regeneration, whereby the *Catechumen* was. For as this is a thing which is well worthy the name of an *election*, but however much more proper to be insinuated to *Babes in Christ*, than those never to be fathomed depths of God's Decrees, so the opinion the Church hath of Baptism, (and which in its due place I shall endeavour to confirm) gives reason to believe that it intended those *elect* ones, when it affirm'd the Holy Ghost to be the sanctifier of them all. Which suppos'd, there can be no doubt of the truth of that its affirmation, whether we consider those elect, either as infants or adult persons: The Church believing, and not without cause, his *actually* sanctifying all those who are baptized in their infancy, as his *being in a disposition* to sanctifie all the rest, and actually sanctifying such of them as do not put a bar to it. The principal difficulty, in my opinion, is, how what we have now said concerning the thus restraining of his influences is consistent with that general love which he bears to all mankind, and that testimony which he gave of it in sending his Son to die for them. But as that is a difficulty which I will not pretend wholly to avoid, because I find few modest men pretending to an ability for it; so I can satisfy myself, and may perhaps others, by conceiving that the Holy Ghost is not wanting, by some preparatory influences, to excite and dispose even those, who live without the pale of the Church, to some lower degrees of holiness, and which because they answer not, he denies them that sanctifying influence, which he affords liberally enough to those to whom the Gospel is promulgated. This, I say, is the thing that satisfies me, though if it did not I could not think fit for that reason to deny Gods general love to, and Christ's dying for all mankind, as which seem to me so clearly asserted by the Scripture. Whether what I have said will satisfy other men, I am not able to say, neither will I concern my self to enquire. Instead thereof I shall offer somewhat toward the solution of that question, which comes next in order to be handled, even



3. How what we have said concerning this Holy Ghost's being the entire Author of our sanctity is consistent with the *liberty of our own will*, and those many *precepts* and *exhortations*, which prompt us to *procure and exercise it*. For if our sanctification be the proper and peculiar work of the Holy Ghost, what place is there for our consent, and, if there be none, to what purpose are all those exhortations in the Scripture which persuade us to the endeavouring of it? For answer to which I cannot think of a better expedient, than to suppose that whereas we were before inclin'd only to sin, the Spirit of God, by the preaching of the Gospel, gives us a power to accept that grace of his whereby our sanctification is effected. For hereby the consent of the will and the glory of God's grace will at the same time be salv'd; the consent of the will by the power which is given it, the entire glory of this Spirit's grace by ascribing that power to him, as the following work of our sanctification to the sole vertue of that grace which the former power enables us to accept. The same may be said concerning those frequent exhortations in Scripture to *work out our own salvation with fear and trembling*. For if God by the preaching of the Gospel ministers such a power, as that before spoken of, to accept that grace by which we live a spiritual life, then is there place for the exercise of that power, and consequently of exhortations to it. Thus I am fain to reason to satisfy my own mind, so far as I may be able to do in so perplex'd an argument. If any man can think of a better expedient, let him in Gods name enjoy it, or rather make others partakers with him of it. Only let not men, because of the difficulty of reconciling God's *grace* and our *free will* together, proceed to deny either, which certainly is a far greater error, than any expedient that can be offer'd for the reconciling of them. For what violence must we offer to the Scripture, if we acknowledge not to God's Spirit the entire sanctification of us? And what violence both to that, and our own reason, if we deny that *liberty of will*, without which there can be no place for those pious endeavours to which we are call'd, or for any just condemnation of us, if we omit them?

# The holy Catholick Church.

## The Contents.

*Of the sense of the word Church in the present Article, which is shewn from the Creed and the doctrine of the Ancients to import the whole number of Christians confederated into a Society or body. A transition from thence to a more exact definition of it, where the Church is shewn to be a Society or body of men called by God from out of the rest of the world to the obedience and privileges of the Christian faith, and in compliance with that call making profession of it, as that too, in a considerable part of it, with sincerity and truth. Evidences of the several parts of this definition out of the doctrine of the Scriptures, and in what hands the power of the Society is vested. Enquiry thereupon made into the existence of it, and the Church shewn to have been in being from the first moment of its pretending to be so, to continue as yet in being, and that it shall do so to the end of the world. The affections of this Society or body brought under consideration, and evidence made in an especial manner of the unity thereof, together with the consequences of it. What we are to understand by holy and Catholick, and what evidence there is of the Churches being really such.*

**A**fter the profession of our faith in the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, (which, as our *Catechism*<sup>a</sup> instructs us, are the *principal objects* of our belief) the next thing proposed to us is *The holy Catholick Church*, for so it follows in the *Creed*. Not that this is any of those things which we are to *believe in* (in the usual notion of that phrase) but which we are to believe *to be*, and to be *such* as is here describ'd. Of which left any should doubt, and thereby stumble at the profession of it, though the expression of our faith be the same<sup>b</sup> in the *Greek* copies of the *Constantinopolitan Creed* with those before us<sup>c</sup> concerning the persons of the *Trinity*, yet our *Church* in its version of it<sup>d</sup>, hath taught us to say, *I believe one Catholick and Apostolick Church*. In the handling of which Article I will proceed in this method,

1. I shall shew what we are here to understand by *Church*.
2. Demonstrate the *existence* of it.
3. Shew it to be *such* as it is here describ'd.

**I.** As the *Creed* is the thing which we are to explain, and, when we have done so, establish the several *Articles* thereof by the doctrine of the *Scripture*; so it will therefore be requisite for us, toward the explication of *this*, to find out, if possible, what is meant by *Church*, and so much the rather because that word is capable of several senses, and so us'd by the *Scriptures* of the *New Testament*. In order whereunto we are to know, what is sufficiently evident from the word *Catholick* or *universal*, that as there is not the least pretence for the understanding it of any other here, than a collection of men professing the *Christian faith* (for

*The holy Catholick Church.*

<sup>a</sup> what dost thou chiefly learn in these Articles of thy belief? *Question* after the *Creed*.

<sup>b</sup> εις μιαν εὐ-  
αν καθολικὴν  
καὶ ἀποστολικὴν  
ἐκκλησίαν.

<sup>c</sup> *Communion Service.*

though the word *Church* may also signifie both their *Assembling* together and the *place* of it, yet no Assembly or place can contain them all) so we are to understand, for the same reason, such a collection of Christians as comprehends the whole number of them. Which one notion, if well considered, will lead us farther into the due importance of the word *Church*, than it may be we were aware of. For supposing the *Creed* to speak the language of the Scripture, as we must do if we believe it to have been either composed by the Apostles, or deduced from their writings, which they, who speak least of it, acknowledge; and we must also suppose that it meant thereby a number of Christians confederated into one *Society* or *body*, and so linked both to Christ and one another. For thus it is apparant the Scripture speaks of it, when taking it in its most comprehensive notion, because not only representing it as the <sup>d</sup> *body of Christ*, but affirming that body to receive nourishment<sup>e</sup> from its head Christ, and the several members of it to communicate in each others griefs<sup>f</sup> and joys. Agreeable hereunto is the doctrine of those Ancients which have handed the Creed to us, and who therefore may be supposed to be competent judges of the meaning of it; For thus in particular it is affirmed by *Tertullian*<sup>g</sup>, in whom the first clear mention of *this Article* appears, that after the pledging our faith and hope in the holy Trinity, the mention of the Church is necessarily added, because where those three are, there is also the Church which is the body of the three: Which shews that the word *Church* was not only intended to denote the whole number of Christians, yea when, for ought appears, the title of *Catholick* was not added to it, but as moreover confederated into one Society or body, and into a communion with their head and with each other; This as it is the most proper notion of the word *body*, and therefore not lightly to be departed from, so being to be presum'd to be the sense of it, when not only affirm'd to be the *body* of such a person or persons, but so understood by that very Scripture, from which the appellation was borrowed.

It appearing from the premises that <sup>Christ</sup> *that Christ* whereof we speak is not barely a number of men making the same profession, but united into a Society or body, we shall not be long to seek what kind of Society it is. For having before shewn it to be a Society of which Christ Jesus is the head, it will soon appear to be a Society or body of men called by God from out of the rest of the world to the obedience and priviledges of the Christian faith and in compliance with that call making profession of it, as that too, in a considerable part of it, with sincerity and truth. Of this Society being call'd by God from out of the rest of the world, we have not only for a probable proof the etymology of the word ἐκκλησία or Church, as which is manifestly deriv'd from the verb ἐκκαλεῖν which signifies to call out, but (which is of much greater force) the members of that Church frequently affirm'd to be called by God to that profession which they make, yea called out of darkness<sup>h</sup> into his marvellous light; That is to say, as St. Peter doth before and afterwards explain himself<sup>i</sup>, from among those who were none of his people to the priviledge and holiness of those that are. Not less reason is there to believe, that they, who are thus called by God, are called to the obedience and priviledges of the Christian faith; whether we do consider it as a call to Christianity, or a call both to the obedience and priviledges thereof. For having given that Christ whereof we speak to be head over all things

<sup>d</sup> Eph. 1. 22, 23

<sup>e</sup> — 4. 15, 16.

<sup>f</sup> 1 Cor. 12. 26.

<sup>g</sup> De Baptismo, cap. 6.

<sup>h</sup> 1 Pet. 2. 9.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. & vers. 10.



things to the Church<sup>1</sup>, as that too no less to preside over and govern it<sup>1</sup>, than to dispense his divine blessings<sup>m</sup> to it, he must consequently be sup-  
 pos'd to call both it and its respective members to the obedience and pri-  
 viledges of that faith, which Christ came into the world to publish.  
 The only thing remaining to be accounted for, or wherein indeed any  
 difficulty is, is what is requisite on the *part* of the Church to make it  
 truly such, which the next words of the former *definition* will help to  
 the clearing of. In order whereto we are first to know, that it is of  
 the essence of the Church as such to make *profession* of that faith to  
 which it is invited or call'd. For this Society being founded as for other  
 ends, so more especially for the procuring the *salvation*<sup>n</sup> of those that  
 are the members of it; and that salvation being not to be procur'd with-  
 out the *confession*<sup>o</sup> of that faith for which this Society was instituted, to  
 make it to be that Church which it pretends to be, it must make profession  
 of that Faith to which it was invited or call'd. As indeed well may we so rea-  
 son when we find order given by our Saviour to begin as well as continue  
 this Society by the *baptizing*<sup>p</sup> of those that offer'd themselves unto it; as  
 St. Peter, on whom Christ had promis'd to found it, and who did so  
 when by his preaching<sup>q</sup> he *converted about three thousand souls*, re-  
 quiring men to be *baptiz'd*<sup>r</sup> as well as to *repent* and believe, and so  
 make profession of the Christian Faith, as well as inwardly embrace it.  
 That which seems to have most of difficulty in it, is whether or no, and  
 how far this profession of the faith, without a correspondent *sincerity*  
 within, may give being to the Church, or the members of it. A question  
 which yet may be easily voided, if we consider that Church whereof we  
 speak, either as to all its members, or a part of them, as again, as to the  
 external, or internal priviledges thereof. If we consider the Church as  
 to all ~~its~~ members of what nature or quality soever, so no necessity lies  
 upon us to affirm that it should be sincere in *all* of them, nay the Scripture  
 it self obligeth us to look upon it under another notion: Witness those  
 texts of it in particular, where the *Kingdom of God* or Christ is com-  
 pared to a *field*<sup>t</sup> wherein there are *tares* as well as *wheat*, and to a *net*<sup>u</sup>  
 which gathereth good and bad. For being the Kingdom of God, or  
 Christ, is no other than the Church, or that Society which is gathered  
 by him, and yet that Kingdom is compar'd to a field wherein there are  
 tares as well as wheat, and to a net which gathereth good and bad, it  
 followeth that bad as well as good be look'd upon as belonging to it; till  
 either the last day or the judgment of the Church shall make a separation.  
 In the mean time, though I say that there is no necessity to affirm the Church  
 to be sincere in all its members, yet it is as constantly to be affirm'd that it is  
 and must be sincere as to a *considerable part* of them. For being the Church  
 is in this Article represented as *holy*, and as such propos'd to our belief;  
 being our Saviour promis'd concerning this Church, that he would so es-  
 tablish it, that *the gates of hell*<sup>v</sup> should not prevail against it, which  
 could not be said, unless this Church were really holy in a considerable part  
 of it; It follows that the Church is such a Society or body, as is in a  
 considerable part of it as cordially obedient, as either in whole or part  
 it makes profession to be. The Church being considered as to the *mem-*  
*bers* of it, and so far therefore what is to be said concerning the sincerity  
 thereof clear'd, proceed we to consider it as to the *priviledges* thereof,  
 and for the better attaining whereof this Society was founded. For either  
 those priviledges are *external and temporary*, or they are also *internal*  
 and

<sup>1</sup> Eph. 1. 22.  
<sup>1</sup> — 5. 23.  
<sup>m</sup> — 4. 16.  
<sup>1</sup> — 1. 23.

<sup>n</sup> Act. 2. 47.

<sup>o</sup> Rom. 10. 10.

<sup>p</sup> Mat. 28. 19.

<sup>q</sup> Act. 2. 41. 47.  
 — 38.

<sup>t</sup> Mat. 13. 24;  
<sup>u</sup> — 25.  
 — 47.

<sup>v</sup> Mat. 16. 18.

*and everlasting.* If question be made concerning those priviledges which are only *external and temporary*, so it cannot at all be thought, that inward sincerity is requisite to give being either to the Church, or the members of it. For the head of that Society giving order for the continuing of the tares in that field in which they do arise, doth consequently permit to them the partaking of such outward priviledges, as belong to that Church in which they are. And indeed, as they, who distinguish between the *visible* and *invisible* Church, must allow those, whom they term members of the former, to be members of the Church in some measure, unless there be collusion in the terms; So they must consequently allow them, so far as they are members, the priviledges of the Church, and therefore also, because members of the *visible* Church, all the *visible* priviledges thereof. But to make it yet farther evident that inward sincerity is no way requisite to entitle the Church, or the members of it, to the external priviledges thereof, I will alledge in the second place the capacity the members of the Church are in, yea such of them as are *unsincere*, to convey such priviledges to their Children; It being not to be thought, that they should convey any priviledges to their Children, who are not possess'd of them themselves. It is a known saying that of *St. Paul*, where he exhorts the believing party to continue with the unbeliever. *For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy.* The conclusion which the Church hath thence made is, that it is the priviledge of Christian Parents, and such only, to entitle their children to baptism; there being no other than a *federal* holiness that can be suppos'd to accrue by them. Now of what Christian Parents is it that we are to understand *St. Paul*, when he affirms them to entitle their Children to Baptism, and so to other external priviledges? If we say of all such as make profession of Christianity, whether they be sincere, or no, then must we also allow the Church and the members of it, upon the account of their profession, to have a right to the external priviledges thereof: But if of such Christian Parents only as are also sincere, what security can any man have of his own Baptism, now that it is administred to us in our infancy? Whether our Parents be sincere or no, being knowable only to God who is the searcher of hearts, and but weakly to be guess'd at, where it is not extraordinary, by other men. So far forth therefore as the external priviledges of the Church are concern'd, so far no doubt the Church, and the members of it, will need no other title to them, than what they may lay claim to upon the account of their profession. But as there are internal and eternal priviledges, as well as those that are external and temporary (for Christ is *the Saviour* of his *body* the Church, as well as the outward sanctifier thereof) so to give it a title to them, it must be cordial in its obedience, as well as make profession of it.

But because this great body whereof we speak doth by its being a *body*, as well as by the doctrine of the *Scripture*, imply the having of *many members*, and such as *have not the same office*; and because though Christ be the *head* of the Church, yet he doth not immediately either govern or dispense his influences to it, but by the means of certain persons whom he commissionates for the *edifying*; thereof therefore for the fuller understanding of that body whereof we speak, as well as of our own duty, it will be requisite for us to understand in whose hands this is deposited, and whom

1 Cor. 7. 14.

1 Eph. 5. 23.

2 Rom. 12. 4, 5.

1 Cor. 12. 12. &c.

2 Eph. 4. 11, 12.

whom we our selves are to look upon as entrusted with it. That this power was first vested in the Apostles, no doubt at all can be made; when it appears from the Scripture <sup>b</sup> that *as the father sent him so he sent the Apostles*, adding moreover <sup>c</sup> (than which there cannot be a greater evidence of the plenitude of their power, because the *remitting and retaining of sins* doth either directly or indirectly contain in it all Ecclesiastical power) that *whose soever sins they remitted they should be remitted unto them, and whose soever sins they retained, they should be retained*. The only thing that can be made a question of is, whether they committed this power unto other persons after them, and to whom they did so commit it. But as no great doubt can be made of the former of these, when we understand from our Saviour himself that they were to *preach the gospel to all nations* <sup>d</sup>, yea, as his following promise of *being with them* in it shews, *even unto the end of the world* (for how, when they themselves were not suffered to continue by reason of death, could they answer that commission of theirs, without the delegating of men to succeed them in it?) So much less can we doubt of it, when we are assured by the Scripture, that as the number of believers encreased they appointed men whilst they themselves lived to preside over and instruct them <sup>e</sup>, and so furnish them with those Assistances, which they themselves, by reason of their own great employments, as well as the multitude of believers, could not give them. Taking it therefore for granted, that as the Apostles were commissioned by our Saviour, so they were not wanting to commission others to succeed them in their power, nothing remains to enquire but in whose hands they did deposite it; which is so clear both from the Scripture and the story of the Church to be in the hands of *Bishops, and Priests, and Deacons* under them, that nothing but prejudice and faction could have given being to those Schisms which late years have obliged us to behold. For what other is it than Schism, both from the head, and body of this Society, wittingly and willingly to depart from the obedience of those in whose hands the power of the Church was vested by them, who had the plenitude thereof from its head Christ Jesus? Christ, though, as such, influencing and governing this body of his, yet being declar'd to do both the one and the other by these *joints and sinews*, and which therefore whilst men break off from, how can they pretend to hold either to that head or body to which they are united by them? Whence it was, that that holy Martyr *Ignatius* did not only so often and so earnestly enjoin obedience to these governours of the Church, but in one place <sup>f</sup> roundly assert that *he is deprived of the bread of God who is not within the Altar*, that is to say, (as he elsewhere <sup>g</sup> explains himself) *who doth any thing without the Bishop, and Presbytery, and Deacon*, as *without whom* (as he speaks in a third place <sup>h</sup>) *there cannot be the title of a Church*. This I speak in part upon the presumption there is of the *unalterableness* of that *form* of government which had for its ground the institution of those in whom it must be granted that the full power of the Church was vested; Though supposing even that *form* of government to be *alterable* in it self as the necessity of affairs shall require, yet will not they much advantage themselves thereby, who have detracted the obedience of it, and of those in whom it was duly vested. For it appearing from the premises that the Church is a *body*, yea such a body as, by the institution of Christ, hath *different members* both in *dignity and office*; and it appearing farther, as from the necessity there is

<sup>b</sup> Joh. 20. 21.<sup>c</sup> — 23.<sup>d</sup> Mat. 28. 19;  
<sup>20.</sup><sup>e</sup> Act. 14. 23;  
<sup>f</sup> *alibi*.<sup>f</sup> *Epist. ad Eph.*  
*p. 20. edit. Voss.*  
*Εάν μήτις ἢ*  
*ἐν τῷ τῷ δὲ*  
*οὐκ ἔστιν, ὅτι*  
*ἐστὶν τῷ ἀπὸ*  
*τῷ θεοῦ.*<sup>g</sup> *Epist. ad Tral-*  
*les. p. 50.*  
<sup>h</sup> *Ep. ad Tral-*  
*p. 48.*



of governours in every body, so from Christs commiffionating the Apostles to preſide in it, and their appointing others to ſucceed them, that it was the intention of the head of the Church to diſpenſe his influences to it by governours appointed for that purpoſe, he who ſhall, without the leave of that body, depart from that government to which it hath conſented, ſhall do well to conſider whether he doth not *eo ipſo* cut himſelf off from that Society, and from him who is the head of it: becauſe though the form of government be alterable in it ſelf, yet it is to be preſum'd to be of force ſo long as the Society continues it, and cannot therefore be departed from, without a departure from the Society it ſelf, and (if Chriſt hath either inſtituted that government, or intruſted the Society with the modelling of it) without a departure from him alſo.

II. The Church as you ſee being thus deſcrib'd, enquire we in the next place into the *exiſtence* of it; I do not mean only as to its *preſent* one, but as the conſtant profeſſion of this faith, and the promiſe of Chriſt concerning the perpetuity \* thereof perſwades, as a thing which *hath been* from the beginning of Chriſtianity, *is now*, and *ever ſhall be* in the world. Where again we are to conſider that Church, whereof we ſpeak, not only as a *number* of men profeſſing the Chriſtian Faith, but as combin'd into a *Society*, as that too under *Paſtors* and *Governours*. Though, God be thanked, the truth of theſe latter aſſertions is ſo clear from the Scripture and the ſtory of the Church, that we cannot find, till very lately, any thing pretending to a Church, which did not alſo appear to be a Society, as that too, under thoſe very Paſtors and Governours in whoſe hands the Apoſtles left it. For which cauſe it may ſuffice, (or at leaſt till we come to conſider the unity thereof) to take notice to you of the evidence there is of the being of thoſe who have, do, and ſhall profeſs that Faith, for which this Society was inſtituted. Now as, when queſtion is made concerning the paſt being and continuance of any Society, we are of neceſſity to look ſo far back for each of them as that point of time wherein it pretends to have had its foundation, ſo if we take the ſame courſe as to the indagation of the being of this, we ſhall find it was not to be till after the time that the Apoſtles were furniſhed with an ability for the erecting of it, but withal preſently upon it, and from the time that St. Peter, by whoſe miniſtry it was more eſpecially to be founded, ſhould ſet himſelf to the doing of it. For being to be *built upon the foundation of the Apoſtles* <sup>i</sup> as well as *Prophets*, thoſe *Apoſtles* were firſt of all to be furniſhed with power for that purpoſe, which they were not till the *Pentecoſt* <sup>k</sup> after our Saviours *Aſcenſion*; and being more eſpecially to be founded by the miniſtry of St. Peter (as thoſe words of Chriſt to him *Thou art Peter, &c.* <sup>l</sup> do to an unprejudiced Reader apparantly ſignifie, and were accordingly ſo interpreted by the Ancients <sup>m</sup>) it was not to be founded till he had addreſs'd himſelf to the doing of it. But as from the time that he and the other Apoſtles were endu'd with power from on high, we are in reaſon to expect that both he and they ſhould give beginning to it, ſo correſpondently thereto we find by the *Acts* <sup>n</sup> of the Apoſtles, that on that very day, on which the Holy Ghoſt fell upon them, St. Peter by his preaching converted *about three thouſand ſouls*, and ſo by that and their future Baptiſm, gave beginning to that body the Church, which Chriſt had

\* Mat. 16. 18.  
28. 19, 20.

<sup>i</sup> Eph. 2. 20.

<sup>k</sup> Act. 2. 1. &c.

<sup>l</sup> Mat. 16. 18.

<sup>m</sup> Loquitur dominus ad Petrum, Ego tibi dico, inquit, quia tu es Petrus & super istam petram edificabo ecclesiam meam, &c. Et iterum eidem post resurrectionem suam dicit, Pascere oves meas. Et quamvis Apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat, & dicat, Sicut misi me Pater, & ego mitto vos, &c. tamen ut unitatem manifestaret, unitatis ejusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua Auctoritate disposuit. Hoc erant utiq; & ceteri Apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio praeediti & honoris & potestatis, sed exordium ab unitate proficiſcitur. Cyprian. de unit. Eccl. Edit. Jerem. Stephani, cap. 3. <sup>n</sup> Acts 2. 41.

long

long before promised the foundation of by him. Such evidence there is of the founding of the Church agreeably to the pretensions of it, and the promises of the head of it; and the sequel of that *book of the Acts* <sup>Acts 2. 47.</sup> and the *story of the Church* proves no less, that God hath continued to add to it, and preserv'd it till our own times. So that all we have to account for is the present being of the Church, and the continuing of it till the end of the world. Of the former whereof as we have our own sense for a witness, and (if we be faithful members of it) inward experience also; so we have for the latter the promise of him who is *yea* and *Amen*, and concerning whose fidelity we have the less reason to doubt, because we have had the experience of more than sixteen hundred years to assure us of it. For what less than a perpetuity can those promises of Christ be thought to import, which do not only assure the *building* of this *Church upon a rock* <sup>Mar. 16. 18.</sup>, yea so firmly that the *gates of hell should not be able to prevail against it*, but that he *would be with the builders of it* <sup>— 28. 19;</sup> *even unto the end of the world*, and so prosper them in those their labours and endeavours? <sup>20.</sup>

III. What the notion of the Church is, and that there hath been, is, and shall be such a one hath been already declar'd, it remains that we shew that Church to be such as is here describ'd, to wit *one* and *holy* and *Catholick*.

1. That the Church is *one* our *Creed* sufficiently intimates by putting it in the *singular* number, but that in the *Communion service* doth more plainly expresse to be so. And therefore for the more full explication of the *Creed*, we must shew it to be such, with the consequences that are to be drawn from it.

1. And here in the first place I shall alledge those texts of Scripture, which represent the whole Society of Christians under the name of the *Church*: of which sort are those especially, where it is said that God gave Christ to be head <sup>Eph. 1. 22.</sup> *over all things to the Church*, and that he is <sup>Col. 1. 18.</sup> *the head of his body the Church*. For being Christ is the head not of this or that particular number of Christians, but of all that are, have been, or shall be called by that name, we cannot in reason understand by Church any thing less than the whole number of Christians, and consequently (because otherwise they could not be comprehended under one name) must believe them to be some way *one*.

2. But we have yet greater evidence of the unity of this Society, even a distinct and expresse affirmation of it: Witness those many texts of Scripture which represent it as *one body* how many soever the members thereof be, more particularly that wherein it is said, that *we being many are one bread and one body* <sup>1 Cor. 10. 17.</sup> *inasmuch as we are all partakers of one bread*. For being the bread of the sacrament is common not to the members of this or that particular Church only, but to all Christians in the general; therefore, when St. Paul alledges this partaking of it as an argument of their being *one body*, he must include all Christians in it, because alike partaking of that *one bread*.

3. And this leads me in the third place to shew the ground of this unity which will be the best establishment of it: Which will soon be discovered if we reflect upon what hath been before intimated to constitute a Society, and consequently which makes the Church to be so. For if that be *one* which makes the Church a society, then must the Church be so also and not only by way of aggregation, as a heap of stones is one,

but by way of order and communion, as any other Corporation is, which is under the same head and is managed by the same laws. Now there are four things which constitute a Society, and which therefore if we can shew to be one and the same in the Church, we shall at the same time shew the Church it self to be one; its being under one head, its living by the same Laws, its maintaining a reciprocal communion within it self, and partaking of the same privileges. For is the head of the Society to be one? The Christian society knows but one head, even that Christ from whom it is nam'd. Of which if any doubt should be made after what hath been already said to shew that he is the head of the Universal Church; that of St. Paul will put it out of all, where he tells us that though there be *in the world Gods many and Lords many, yet to us there is but one God, and one Lord*<sup>1</sup> *Jesus Christ*, and elsewhere<sup>2</sup> that there is but *one Lord*. Again is it requir'd to the unity of a Society, that it live at least by the same general laws? The Christian Church will be found to be one in this respect also, whether we consider such laws as regard the inward frame of it, or the outward polity thereof. For, as the same St. Paul goes on<sup>3</sup> in the place last refer'd to, there is *one* and but one *faith* to actuate and inform it, and *one* and but one *baptism* for it to make profession of that faith by, as elsewhere *we are all partakers of one bread*. The same is to be said concerning the privileges of this Society, as was before of the laws of it. For beside (as was but now intimated) that the Sacraments (which are privileges, as well as duties) are common to all of this body; the place before alledged out of the *Ephesians* doth clearly instruct us, that we are *all called in one*<sup>4</sup> *hope of our calling*. Lastly are the members of one and the same Society obliged by the laws of it to maintain a particular and reciprocal communion with each other? The members of the Christian Church will appear to be so obliged by what we read in the *twelfth chapter* of the *first Epistle* to the *Corinthians*. For St. Paul having there set forth at large the care and interest that each of the members of the natural body have in the happiness or unhappiness of one another, to shew Christians to be under the like obligation by the laws of that body whereof they are, he immediately subjoins<sup>5</sup>, *Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular*. Of which what other can be thought to be the meaning, than that the same communion is requir'd of the members of the Church by the laws of that body whereof they are?

4. Now though from what hath been said it be sufficiently evident, that that body whereof we speak, how diffused soever, is but one, and ought so to continue by the institution of the founder of it; yet because it is not to be thought, that, if that were the intention of its head and founder, so holy a body as the Church is, would have suddenly departed from it; and because it can be no contemptible argument of the intended unity thereof, that that body whereof we speak did at first look upon it self as one, and acted with that accordance which became it, therefore to make it yet farther evident that this Society or body is but one, I will see whether ought can appear in its primitive behaviour to evict that supposed unity to us. Though I would to God we could at present find but the half of that evidence, which is to be found in the Church of ancient times. For who can read that passage of *Irenaeus*, which he subjoins to the mention of the *Apostles Creed*, and not also believe, but that the Church, how diffused soever, look'd upon it self

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. 8. 6.<sup>2</sup> Eph. 4. 5.<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*<sup>4</sup> Eph. 4. 4.<sup>5</sup> 1 Cor. 12. 27.



as one body, and oblig'd to be so. For *this preaching and faith* (faith that holy father<sup>c</sup>) being receiv'd by it, the Church though dispersed over the whole world diligently keeps as if it dwelt in one house, and both gives belief to the Articles thereof as if it had one soul and the same heart, and uniformly preacheth, and teacheth, and delivers these things as if it had but one mouth. For though the dialects that are in the world are very different, yet the force of tradition is one and the same. And neither do the Churches in Germany believe or deliver otherwise, nor the Churches that are in Spain, or Gaul, or the Eastern parts, or Egypt, or Libya, or in the middle parts of the world. But as the sun, that creature of God, is one and the same in the whole world, so also doth the preaching of truth every where appear, and enlighten all men that are willing to come to the knowledge of the truth. But it is not only the unity of faith, which the universal Church took care to preserve, and so approve it self to be one Society or body; for the several parts of it had the like care to preserve communion with each other, and look'd upon themselves as oblig'd to do so. Witness first their mutual admitting to communion such of the members of other Churches as were either known, or commended to them by the Letters<sup>d</sup> of those Churches of which they were. The former whereof is so true, that though there were some differences between Polycarp Bishop of Smyrna and Anicetus then Bishop of Rome, yet the latter did not only admit the former to his communion, but gave him liberty<sup>e</sup> to consecrate the sacrament in his Church. And though those letters whereof I spake (and which, for the reason before mentioned, had the name of *Pacifick* and *Communicatory* ones) may seem in some places to have been of less Authority, because the Council of Illiberis<sup>f</sup> enjoins however the proving of those that brought them; yet was it only (as the sequel of that Canon shews) to know whether the things affirm'd of them in those letters were true; and they would confirm by their own testimony that faith which the other declared them to maintain. Which shews that their being of any one Church gave men a right to communicate with all, and that the several Churches of the world thought themselves obliged to admit them. I may not omit to take notice of a passage of Tertullian, because it is so clear an intimation of that unity of the Church whereof I speak, and of particular Churches giving this proof of their belief of it. For *therefore* (saith he<sup>g</sup>) *so many and so great Churches are that one first Church from the Apostles, from which are all. So they are all the first and Apostolical, while they all together prove unity, while they maintain the communication of peace, the title of brotherhood, and the common mark of hospitality*; alluding therein (as Justellus hath observ'd) to those *πιστολιμαία συνδήματα* or letters of Marque which the Bishops of Churches gave to such of their members as travel'd abroad, to procure them both communion and entertainment. But because the Church could then only thus communicate when there was an occasion for the members thus passing to and fro, which in some remote places might not often occur, therefore they had yet other ways to declare it, and particularly by sending every year the mysteries of the holy Sacrament to one another, as a

<sup>a</sup> Iren. adv. hær. refut. li. 1. cap. 3.

<sup>d</sup> De hisce literis vid. Justell. Notis ad can. 189. Cod. Can. Eccl. Univ. & Mendor. Comment. in Conc. Illiberit. Can. 58. pag. 445.

<sup>e</sup> Euseb. li. 5. Eccl. Hist. c. 24.

<sup>f</sup> Can. 58. Placuit, ut ubique & maxime in eo loco, in quo prima cathedra constituta est Episcopatus, interrogentur hi qui communicant, ut litteras tradunt, an omnia recte habiant, & suo testimonio comprobent.

<sup>g</sup> Itaq; tot ac tante Ecclesie, una est illa ab Apostolis prima, ex qua omnes. Sic omnes prima, & Apostolica, dum una omnes probant unitatem, dum est illis communicatio pacis, & appellatio fraternitatis, & confederatio hospitalitatis, que jura non alia ratio regit, quam ejusdem sacramenti una traditio. De præscript. heret. c. 20.

<sup>h</sup> Ubi supra.

<sup>1</sup> Eccl. Hist. li.  
3. c. 24.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. Eccl.  
Hist. li. 7. c. 30.

<sup>3</sup> Thorndike's E-  
pilogue to the  
Tragedy of the  
Church of Eng.  
li. 2. c. 20.

<sup>4</sup> Thornd. ibid.

certain proof of their communion with and benediction of each other. For thus it appears from a passage of *Innocentius*, as it is preserved by *Eusebium*<sup>1</sup>, that the Ancient Presbyters of the Church of *Rome* did to the Presbyters even of those Churches that differ'd from them about the observation of Easter; as it is plain from the 14. Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*, that it was generally done, though forbidden by that Council because of the inconveniences thereof. But of all the proofs which the story of the Church affords us of that unity which ought by the institution of Christ to be between the several parts of it, there is none more clear than those *communicatory* letters<sup>2</sup> which the new elected Bishop of any place sent to the Bishops of other Churches, as they again to him. For to what purpose those communicatory letters, were it not that the Church was then look'd upon as one body, yea so far that no man could pass for a Bishop of any particular Church, who did not both communicate with, and receive communion from the other. Which is so true, that, when *Paulus Samosatensis*, who had been ejected out of his Bishoprick by a Synod, refused to quit the Episcopal house to him who was by the same Synod substituted in his room, the Emperour *Aurelianus*, though a Heathen, yet was not such a stranger to the affairs of Christianity, as not to adjudge the house to him to whom the Bishops of *Italy* and *Rome* should write, as upon whose consent<sup>3</sup>, because such remarkable parts of the Church, the consent of the rest might be reasonably presum'd. In fine so perswaded were the Governours of particular Churches of the unity of that universal Church whereof they were, that they, who were cut off from the communion of one particular Church, were thereby adjudg'd<sup>4</sup> as cut off from the communion of the whole. And accordingly when *Marcian* upon his being put out of the Church by his father the Bishop of *Sinope* in *Pontus*, appli'd himself to the Church of *Rome* for redress, he receiv'd this Answer that they could not do it without his fathers consent, because the faith is one, and the unity the same. Not unlike whereunto is that passage of *Synesius* upon his proceeding against *Andronicus*, that if any Church, neglecting his Church of *Ptolemais* as a poor Church, being the Church of a small city, should receive into communion those whom that had excommunicated, he should thereby be guilty of dividing the Church, which Christ will have to be but one.

I have insisted the longer upon this position, because the consequences thereof are many and weighty. For from hence it appears *first*, even from the Churches being one Society, that all Christians are by vertue thereof oblig'd, as often, and as much as distance of place will permit them, to communicate with each other, and consequently that those persons are guilty of making a Schism in the body of Christ, who either causelessly break this communion themselves, or give the occasion of it. It appears *secondly*, that it is so far from being an error, that it is on the other side a duty to communicate so far as we can even with such Churches as are corrupt. For being oblig'd to communicate with all Christians, as hath been before declar'd; so far as they continue to be Christian and members of the Church, so far the obligation must consequently reach, however ceasing in other matters. It appears *thirdly* that particular Christians and particular Churches are to submit to the orders of the whole, or the greater part of it. For being (as hath been shewn at large) but one Society or body, and particular Christians or Churches

Churches but members of it, whatsoever shall be concluded by the whole, or the greater part of it, must oblige all particulars in it. And though *custom* be not a thing equivalent to an order, because but a tacit declaration of the mind of that Society wherein it is of force, yet it would be considered *fourthly*, whether, being a declaration of its mind, though not so express, it can be fairly rejected by such, as would be accounted sober and peaceable members of it: Especially when St. Paul, where he disputes against a singularity in the Church of *Corinth*, thought it enough to tell them that they had *no such custom nor the Churches of God*. For of what force were that allegation of his, if a general custom of the Church might not give law to particular members, and particular Churches in it? Only when I say that the orders or customs of the universal Church, or the greater part of it, ought to give law to the remaining ones; I think it but necessary to add first, that that ought to be understood, where those orders or customs are within the limits of that Religion for the preservation whereof this Society of the Church was instituted. For being founded for the preservation of the Christian Religion, it cannot consequently be supposed to be empower'd to enjoin any thing to the destruction of it, and therefore neither by any orders or customs whatsoever to oblige particular members or particular Churches, to conform to the obedience of it. Indeed so far as it acts contrary to its prime end, and the laws of its head Christ Jesus, so far it ceaseth to be of his body, and we therefore not only no way obliged by the laws of it, but obliged on the contrary to withdraw our obedience from it, as without which we cannot answer that former, and therefore more forcible obligation, which we have to the founder both of the Religion and the Church. Upon which account all those reformation of particular Churches must be look'd upon as both justifiable and necessary, which tend only to reduce things to a conformity to the precepts of that Religion (for the preservation of which the Church was instituted) and of him who was the founder both of Religion and it. All that may seem to lie against this inference of ours is the incompetency that may seem to be in a particular Church, and so but a member of the universal, to proceed without the consent of that to such a Reformation as is Authoritative: Because particular Churches, in respect of the whole, may seem but as private persons, when acting either without, or against the consent of that greater body, whereof they are. But as in so diffused a body, as the *Catholick Church* is, we must suppose the Authority thereof to be so far distributed amongst *particular Churches*, as may enable them at least to preserve their own members in that profession of Christianity, for which both the one and the other were ordain'd, because that Religion, for which they were ordain'd, might suffer detriment, if they had no other remedy in their hands, than a redress from the *Universal*, which (as things may happen) may be very long before it can be procur'd, if it can be procur'd at all: So we shall find much more reason so to suppose, if it may appear both from the Scripture, and the allowed practice of the Church, that such an Authority is really vested in particular ones. Which that it is, that charge of St. Paul to the *Elders of Ephesus*, when he was now to take his last leave of them, may, so far as the Scripture is concern'd, serve for an abundant evidence. For not only admonishing them to feed their own flock (which yet imports government as well as teaching) but to take heed to them and watch over them, and particularly in respect of those per-

1 Cor. 11:16

Act. 20. 28, &c.

verfe



verse *teachers* that should arise among them; admonishing them moreover to do both the one and the other in regard of that *oversight* of them, which was committed to them by the Holy Ghost; he plainly intimates that they were by that *Holy Ghost* furnished with sufficient Authority *in themselves* to preside over that flock which was committed to them. Agreeable hereto is the allowed practice of the Church, and which because such, will give farther light both to the Apostles meaning, and the opinion of that Society concerning whose Authority we are enquiring. For not only have particular Churches thus watched over their respective flocks, and convoked the Pastors of them to determine of the weightiest matters, but the Canons of those Councils been so far allow'd, as to be enter'd into the Code <sup>p</sup> of the Universal Church, as that too, for ought appears, without any mark upon them for their suppos'd presumption in determining of such weighty matters by themselves. I may not omit a passage of St. *Cyprian*, because it hath a place in that tract of his <sup>q</sup> which was intended to maintain the *unity of the Church*, yea is it self an argument thereof. For though he doth affirm *the Episcopacy to be one*, yet he affirms *a part of that to be held in solidum by every particular Bishop*. For how could he affirm that, if the Episcopacy were not fully possess'd by each, so far as was necessary for the securing of Christianity in those flocks that are committed to them? Now whereas it is objected, that whilst we allow particular Bishops or particular Churches thus to act by themselves, we must break the Church into many distinct Societies, and so destroy that unity we contend for; or make those particular Bishops and Churches but as private persons when so acting, because (if but parts of the whole) they are to be accounted of only as private persons, when acting either without, or against the consent of the remaining ones; I answer, that neither *first* will any detriment accrue to the unity of the Church by breaking it into many particular Societies, provided those particular Societies act with subordination to the whole body in all such acts as that body is empowered to perform. For whilst particular Societies do thus subordinate themselves to the whole, they continue to acknowledge themselves to be members of the Catholick Church, and consequently that the Church is not many distinct Societies but one. Now as nothing hinders those particular Churches, which (where there is occasion) reform by themselves, from doing what they do with subordination to the Catholick, as being willing, when opportunity shall offer it self, to receive direction from it; So their acting (if there be occasion) against the remaining parts of it, doth not at all prejudice that subordination to the Catholick, which is due from particular Churches to it: Because that subordination, which is required of them to preserve the unity of the Church, cannot be suppos'd to hold any farther, than that general body, whereof they are, shall be found to hold by the laws of him who is the head of it. For indeed so far it ceaseth to be a Church, and therefore also to require the others subordination to it. Provided therefore those particular Churches, which reform by themselves, do *bona fide* subordinate themselves to the body of the Catholick in all those things wherein the Catholick Church holds by the laws of the founder of it, it is not they who do any thing toward the breaking the unity of the Catholick Church, but those Churches rather, how many soever they be, which refuse their consent to that reformation which is desir'd and attempted by the other. I say secondly, that as no prejudice is done to the unity of the Catholick Church by

<sup>p</sup> Vid. Justelli  
Cod. Can. Eccl.  
universæ.

<sup>q</sup> Cyprian de  
unitate Ecclesiæ  
c. 4. Episcopa-  
tus unus est, cu-  
jus à singulis in  
solidum pars  
tenetur.

by the necessary Reformation of particular ones, even without and against the remaining parts of it, so neither can we look upon them, when so acting, as only private persons, because only parts of that great Society whereof we speak. And the reason is first, because they do what they do, not without Authority from him who is the common head of it, and in whom all the jurisdiction of the Church is originally vested; Secondly, because they depart not from the Society it self any farther, than those parts of it, against the consent whereof they do reform, depart from their head, and so far therefore are not to be look'd upon as parts of it; Thirdly and lastly, because the Society *as such* is to be presum'd to have consented to such laws and orders, as he, who is the head of it, hath impos'd upon it. Which consent of its, because included in the essence of it, must not only prevail above any following acts of it, but be look'd upon as giving force to such acts of particular Churches as are done in pursuance of them: And will consequently make the acts of particular Churches the acts of the whole, and so no longer private but publick and authoritative ones. Hitherto therefore nothing doth appear, why the unity of the Church should be thought to be prejudiced by the necessary Reformations of particular Churches; and we therefore at liberty to bound our conformity to the orders or customs of the Catholick within the limits of that Religion for the preservation whereof it was instituted, and the laws of the head and founder of it. I have one only limitation to add to that conformity which I have said to be due from particular Churches to the orders or customs of the whole; and that is, as to such things which respect the outward policy of the Church, and the received Rites and Ceremonies thereof. For though I no way doubt, even from the forealleged text of St. Paul<sup>1</sup>, that great respect is due<sup>2</sup> from particular Churches to them, yet I cannot but think that, where any of those orders or customs shall be found to be really inconvenient for this or that particular country, it shall be lawful for the Churches thereof to abrogate them as to themselves, and substitute other and more convenient ones in their room: Partly because different rites have always been allow'd in different Churches, even with the consent of the Catholick Church it self, and do indeed, where the peace of the Church is not interrupted by them, so much the more commend<sup>3</sup> the unity of the faith; and partly, because it may well be presum'd, that the Catholick Church intends not the conformity of particular Churches to those orders or customs of it, any farther than they shall be found to serve those ends of piety and order for which they were instituted by it. Only let particular Churches have a care, that they be well satisfied in themselves concerning the inconveniency thereof; as without which they cannot be thought not to make a rent in that body which the head of it Christ Jesus would have to be as entire<sup>4</sup> as his own coat.

<sup>1</sup> Irenæus apud Euseb. Eccl. Hist. li. 5. c. 24. Ubi loquitur de diversitate Paschalis jejunii. Καὶ ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς πάντες ἔτοιμασεν τὰ καὶ σινησθῶναι πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς, καὶ ἡ διαφορά τῆς ἑσπέρης καὶ ἡμετέρας τῆς αἰσεως συνίσταται.

<sup>2</sup> Hoc unitatis Sacramentum, hoc vinculum

concordiæ inseparabiliter coherentis ostenditur; quando in Evangelio tunica Dom. nostri Jesu Christi non dividitur omnino, nec scinditur, sed sortientibus de veste Christi, quis ipsam potius indueret, integra vestis accipitur, & incorrupta atq; individua tunica possidet. Cyr. de unitate Eccl. c. 6.

2. Having thus dispatch'd that first affection of the Church, and shewn it to be *one* Society or body, it remains that we also declare it to be *holy* and Catholick according as it follows in this Article. I said before in my definition of the Church, that it might be considered as to

to such members of it as only make a profession of Christianity, or such as are also inwardly sincere. Proportionably to which we shall find a double holiness to belong to the Catholick Church, an external and an internal holiness. With the former of these holinesses all the members of the Church are holy, as being not only *call'd with a holy calling*, but separated from the rest of the world by those Sacraments and institutions (which are the signs and instruments of holiness) and in some measure observing the precepts of it. With the latter as well as the former holiness all such are holy as are full members of the Church, they who are *Israel* as well as *of Israel*. And this is undoubtedly that holiness *especially* which we profess to believe, when we say we believe *the holy Catholick Church*: As is evident both from that holiness which is immediately before made the effect of the Holy Ghost in us, and the design of our Saviour in the redemption of his Church; which St. Paul tells us <sup>a</sup> to be *that he might sanctifie and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, and that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish*. Now being our Saviour could not be suppos'd to fall short of his design, yea hath given assurance <sup>x</sup> to the world that he would certainly accomplish it (for neither otherwise could it have been said with truth that he would be *with the ministers of it to the end of the World*, as whose labours without that holiness would have been fruitless, and much less that he would establish it *so* that the *gates of hell should not prevail against it*) since we are not without credible proofs of the continuance of this holiness from the time of the Apostles downward, nor (God be thanked) though fallen into the dregs of time, without the like testimonies of it even now, and which do the more ascertain the belief of its alwayes abiding; It follows that this Church not only hath been, is, and shall be to the end of the world, but that it hath been, is, and shall be *holy*, even with that holiness which is strictly and properly such.

3. We have nothing now to account for but the title of *Catholick*, which as it is known to signifie in it self *universal*, so is no less known, when appli'd to the Church, to signifie its *diffusing it self over the world*. And in this notion if we understand the word *Catholick* here, as it is apparant the Ancient Christians understood it, so we shall not need to go any farther than our selves for a proof of it; because though so far remov'd from the place of its foundation and the other parts of the world, as to be look'd upon as separated from it, yet we are now become a considerable part of it. For as *our* conversion to the Church who are so far remov'd from the place of its foundation is an argument of the diffusiveness thereof, so is it a reasonable inducement to believe, that God will fully perform what he hath promised, and make all the kingdoms of the world <sup>y</sup> the Kingdoms of God and of his Christ. Thus much I say is evident to have been the sense of the word *Catholick*, and the thing intended by it hath Scripture, and History, and experience to vouchit; But for the consecrations that are commonly drawn from it, they have not the like certainty, nor yet the same foundation in that *Creed* we are now upon. For when the Church can be no farther what it pretends to be, than by the maintaining of that *faith* for the preservation of which it was ordain'd; when he, who first expounded the *Creed*, even where he opposeth the *Church* here spoken of to the *conventicles of hereticks*, yet distinguisheth

<sup>a</sup> Eph. 5. 26,  
27.

<sup>x</sup> Mat. 28. 19,  
20. — 16. 18.

<sup>y</sup> Psal. 2. 8.  
— 72. 8-11.



distinguisheth the Church from them by the *integrity of its faith*<sup>2</sup>, and not by the *Catholicism* thereof; I cannot think the term of *Catholick Church* can be a sufficient plea against any heretical one, unless we either so interpret the word *Catholick* as to take within the compals of it that of the *Apostles* also, which is of it self a sufficient prescription against it; or refer it to those Ages when the Church kept at unity in it self, and had no *Temporal* or *Spiritual* Lord to put any force upon the definitions of it. For as, when a separation is made, the term of *Catholick* can signifie no other than the *major part* of the Church, which though, as a *major part*, it may prescribe unto the rest in all those things which are within the limits of that faith which constitutes it, yet cannot be suppos'd to prescribe to them any farther; So it is not difficult to conceive, how, when any great Lord, whether *Spiritual* or *Temporal*, shall come to prevail, he may so influence the *major part* of the Church, as to make it bow to those opinions which he himself is desirous to propagate. Of which, to omit other proofs, we have the times of *Constantius* the Emperour to bear witness, and whose favour to the *Arian* heresie gave so large a spread to it that if *Catholicism*, or rather the *major part* of the Church might have been allow'd to give law to the rest without any limitations whatsoever, the divinity of the Son of God would for that time have been no very good doctrine, because it had then the fewest to befriend it. And though I no way doubt, even from the sequel of that story, that God will both take care to preserve the Christian faith amidst all the outrages it meets with, and in time, in a great measure, deliver it from them, yet I see no more reason to believe, that the Church, in the greater part of it should be alway found in the faith, than there is to believe that it is so holy, which they who assert the former will find but little temptation to affirm. As therefore when we affirm the *greater part* (for that is all the *Catholicism* can now be pretended to) to give law to the rest, we are of necessity to understand it in such things only as are within the limits of that faith which constitutes it, and of the laws of him who is the head and founder of it: So we have much more reason to prescribe against it, when we see so great a part of the Church (as that which is within the communion of the Church of *Rome*) either terrified, or sworn, or cajol'd into an absolute obedience to it. For whilst other Churches continue thus devoted unto one; they are in effect but as one suffrage, and have therefore so little right to prescribe against the fundamental laws of it, that they are not in reason to be look'd upon (how many soever they be) as only a *major part*, till God shall give them the grace or happiness to act with more freedom and indifference. If any thing worthy the name of *Catholick* may now be found, it must be in that *Ancient* Church, which believing it self (by the institution of its head) to be *one society* or *body*, diligently watch'd over that *one* faith which it had receiv'd from the *Apostles*, and by the *intercourse* of *Letters* so preserv'd and propagated it, that *Heresie* or *Schism* could no sooner enter in, but it was ejected out of all the parts of it, and made to appear by sensible effects to have no relation to that body of which Christ Jesus is the head. He therefore that shall adjoin himself to that truly *Catholick* and *Apostolick* Church, or to any one which keeps close to it (as the Church of *England* by all indifferent men

<sup>2</sup> Ruffin. in Exposit. Symbol. Apostol. Hi ergo qui supra in unum Deum credere docti sunt sub mysterio Trinitatis, credere etiam hoc debent, unam esse Ecclesiam sanctam, in qua una est fides & unum baptisma, &c. Ista est ergo sancta Ecclesia; non habens maculam aut rugam. Multi enim & alii Ecclesias congregarunt, ut Marcion, &c. Sed illa ecclesia non sunt sine macula aut ruga perfidie. — De hac autem Ecclesia quae fidem Christi integram servat, audi, &c.

\* Tertull. *de*  
*Prescript. heres.*  
c. 20.

must be allowed to do ) shall not need to fear the imputation of *schismatick*, or indeed of *not communicating with the Catholick one*: Because as *so many and so great Churches* \* as now are, are *but one* in substance with that first from the Apostles out of which are all, so they who shall be at one in faith with it, or with any particular Church that is so, shall thereby partake of the *Catholicism* thereof, and so also become members of that *holy Catholick Church*, which the *Creed* calls upon us to believe, and adjoin our selves unto.

## The Communion of Saints.

### The Contents.

*That the Communion of Saints here spoken of is not that which passeth between the members of the Church militant, but that which is suppos'd to pass between them, and those of the Church triumphant, more particularly between them and the Saints departed. Upon occasion of which, enquiry is made first, whether under the term of Saints in the Creed the Holy Angels also may not be comprehended, and that evinc'd, as from other reasons, so from the perswasion the Church had taken up, about, or before the time that this Article was inserted into the Creed, of the Angels being members of the same Society with us. Enquiry is made secondly, what appearance there is from Scripture of the one or the others being members of it, and both of them shewn to be so by several texts of, or arguments from it. The communion that is between us and each of these thereupon brought under consideration, and therein shewn what communion there is between us and them, both as to privilege and duty; as in this latter again more particularly, what this communion requires of them towards us, and what in like manner it requires of us towards them.*

### The Communion of Saints.

WHEN we have so much reason to believe *The holy Catholick Church* before spoken of to be represented to us as a *Society*, and which therefore, *as such*, implies a communion between all those who are visible and notorious members of it; When though the word *Saints* was at first common to all *holy men*, yet in latter times, and when *this Article* was first inserted, it came more peculiarly to be appropriated to such holy men as were advanced from earth to heaven; When in fine, they, who first took notice of *this Article* insist especially upon the communion there is between the members of the Church militant, and those who are now members of the Triumphant; I cannot see any necessity of insisting upon any other communion than that which is supposed to pass between these so far distant members. Only because there is some appearance of the *Angels* belonging to this Society, as well as the *Saints* in glory, I will enquire,

\* Vid. Pearson  
on the Creed, pa.  
714. edit. 4.

1. Whether under the term of *Saints*, the holy Angels also may not be comprehended.
2. What

2. What appearance there is of the one or the others being members of the same Society with us. And
3. What communion there is between us and them.

I. The ground of my first enquiry is not only the title of *Saints* being common<sup>b</sup> to them with the *Spirits of just men made perfect* (for that I know would be but a weak foundation of it) but the reason I shall afterwards shew there is to believe them members of the same Society, and more particularly the apprehension the Church had taken up of their being really such, about or before the time that this Article of the *Communion of Saints* was first known to have come into the *Creed*. For thus St. *Augustine*<sup>c</sup> in one of those books which he entitled *Of the City of*

*God*, affirms that *we with the Angels make up that one City of God, to which it is said in one of the Psalms* Glorious things are spoken of thee, thou City of God; *part whereof is in pilgrimage in us, part giveth assistance in them*. As in like manner elsewhere, where he professeth to explain our belief of the *holy Church*<sup>d</sup>, that it is to be understood not only as to that part of it which is in pilgrimage on earth, but also as to that heavenly one, which from the time of its first foundation adher'd to God, and never experimented the evil of a fall. That I mean (for so the same Father goes on) which continueth blessed in the *holy Angels*, and, as it ought, is assistant to that part of it which is in pilgrimage, because both shall be one in the participation of eternity, and now is one by the bond of charity. Which passage will shew by the way, that however the *Communion of Saints* came late into the *Creed*, yet it was not so much a new addition to the

Faith, as a more clear and explicate declaration of it: That *holy Catholick Church*, which we before profess to believe, having been intended to signifie, as well that part of the Church which is in Heaven, as that which travelleth here below. Since therefore the *holy Angels* were believ'd to be a part of that Society whereof we speak, as well as the *Saints* in glory; since they were believ'd so to be, about or before that time wherein this Article of the *Communion of Saints* came into the *Creed*; since, in fine, they were believ'd to be included in that *holy Catholick Church*, which we are before call'd upon to believe, and for the fuller explication whereof this Article of the *Communion of Saints* was added; It is but reasonable to think, that they were comprehended in the title of *Saints*, and though if not directly intended by, yet connoted in them.

II. There being reason enough to believe (especially if they may be made to appear to be members of the same Society with us) that the *holy Angels* are comprehended in the term of *Saints*, enquire we in the next place what evidence there is of the one and the others being members of it. In order whereunto I will lay for my ground a passage of the *Author to the Hebrews*, and which, if well clear'd, will sufficiently evince it; That I mean where it is said<sup>e</sup>, that we *are come unto mount Zion*,<sup>f</sup> *and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of Angels; To the general assembly and Church of the first-born which are written in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the Spirits of just men made perfect; And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, &c.* For I demand first of all whether the

<sup>a</sup> cum ipsis enim sumus, una civitas Dei, cui dicitur in Psalmo: Gloriosa dicta sunt de te, civitas Dei; cujus pars in nobis peregrinatur; pars in illis opitulatur. De Civitate Dei li. 10. cap. 7.

<sup>b</sup> Rectus confessionis ordo poscebat, ut Trinitati subiceretur Ecclesia, tanquam habitatori domus sua, & Deo templum suum, & conditori civitas sua. Quae tota hic accipienda est (id est, quam dicimus Credo sanctam Ecclesiam) non solum ex parte, qua peregrinatur in terris, &c. sed etiam ex illa, quae in caelis semper, ex quo condita est, cohaesit Deo, nec ullum sui casus malum experta est. Haec in sanctis Angelis beata persistit; & suae parti peregrinanti, sicut oportet, opitulatur, quia utraq; erit una consortio aeternitatis, & nunc una est vinculo charitatis, &c. August. in Enchiridio, cap. 50.

<sup>c</sup> Deut. 33: 2.  
<sup>d</sup> Job 5: 1.  
<sup>e</sup> 1 Thes. 3: 13.  
<sup>f</sup> comp. with 2 Thes. 1: 7.



persons before spoken of, and particularly the general assembly and Church of the first-born, the company of Angels and spirits of just men made perfect be not linked together into one Society or fellowship. If it be said that *they are*, then is it apparant enough that Angels and Saints are of the same Society with us, and consequently, that, if that Society be no other than the Church, they are members of the Church also. But if not, what account can be given of our being said to be *come unto* or *profelyted* to them all (for that is the Scripture sense of the word) according as is here affirmed by the *Apostle*? it being impossible by one and the same ligament (and Christianity knows no other than that of Baptism) to be linked to such distinct persons as were not before joyn'd together in themselves. Now as when it doth appear, that they, to whom we are *profelyted*, are linked together into one Society, nothing can remain to enquire, but whether that Society be the Church; so that question will be easily voided, by considering what that body is, into which we Christians are *profelyted*. For that being apparantly no other than that body of which Christ Jesus is the head; if we are at the same time *profelyted* into the Society of Angels and glorified Saints, then are they also of it, which was the thing to be demonstrated by us. And indeed neither can we well impose any other sense upon that *Mount Sion* and the *heavenly Jerusalem*, to which we are here said to *come*, than that of the Christian Church, nor account of those that follow, than as parts and portions of it; Partly because of the opposition that is here made between *that* and *mount Sinai*, but more especially because of that light, which is given to, it by a parallel place of St. Paul. For as when the *Author to the Hebrews* opposeth it to that place wherein the law was given, he cannot well be thought to mean any other by *Mount Sion* than the dispensation of the Gospel, and that Society which was founded in it; so much less when St. Paul<sup>e</sup>, who makes the same distinction, not only affirms *Mount Sinai* in Arabia to answer to *Jerusalem* that now is, and is in bondage with her children, but that the *Jerusalem* which is above, or the heavenly one, is the mother of us all: This last passage plainly importing it to be that Christian Church, in which we are born again unto God. Now forasmuch as this *Mount Sion*, and the *heavenly Jerusalem*, is no other than the Church, forasmuch as it hath not only Angels and spirits of just men annumerated to it, as well as the general assembly of them that are only written in heaven, but our selves also affirmed to be *profelyted* to them and it; it follows that those Angels and spirits are of the same Church with our selves, and therefore also that there is and ought to be a communion between them and us.

But because an *Article*, that came so lately into the *Creed*, may seem to require some farther strength than a single text of Scripture can be thought to afford it; and because whatever presumption there may be of Saints departed being members of this Society, yet the holy Angels have not so much as the clear stipulation of the *Creed*; therefore enquire we what farther reason we have to believe these latter ones at least to be parts of that Society whereof we speak. In order whereunto, I shall desire it may be first of all observed that Christ is represented as their head, no less than the head of us or departed Saints. For not only is he affirmed to have *all things* <sup>a</sup> put under his feet, and among others (as is apparant from the foregoing words <sup>b</sup>) *all principality and power and might and dominion*, which is a known periphrasis<sup>c</sup> of the Angels; but elsewhere

<sup>e</sup> Gal. 4. 25, 26.

<sup>a</sup> Eph. 1. 22.  
<sup>b</sup> 21.

<sup>c</sup> Vid. Grot.  
Annot. in Eph.  
2. 21.

elsewhere

elsewhere in exprefs terms to be the head <sup>k</sup> of all principality and power ; <sup>k</sup> Col. 2. 10.  
 and they therefore, (fo far as the being under one and the fame head per-  
 fwades) of the fame Society alfo with our felves. But becaufe nothing  
 hinders, but that one and the fame perfon may be head of different So-  
 cieties, and they therefore who are under the fame head not prefently  
 to be concluded from thence to be of the fame Society, therefore enquire  
 we in the next place, whether it were not the design of this head to gather  
 together into one thofe Angels, whereof we fpeak, and the more notori-  
 ous members of the Church. Which that it was, that of the fame Apoflle  
 feems to me a fufficient proof, where he affirms it to be the intent of God  
 in and by Chrift to gather together in one <sup>l</sup> all things which are in hea- <sup>l</sup> Eph. 1. 10.  
 ven, and which are in earth. For what is it, that fhould make this  
 proof to be thought any way defective? Is it that by things in heaven  
 we are not to underftand the Angels comprehended? But it was the in-  
 tent of God, faith St. Paul, to gather together in one all things that are  
 in heaven, and how much more then thofe who are the moft eminent in-  
 habitants of that place, yea have been fo, ever fince they were created?  
 Is it then that the gathering together in one doth not prove the collect-  
 ing them into one Society? But neither can any doubt be made of that,  
 by thofe who confider the force of the Original word, and the matter  
 to which it is appli'd. For the Greek word ἀνακεφαλαιώσαθαι fignifying pro-  
 perly the gathering together of feveral particular fums into one general  
 one, muft confequently, when appli'd to thofe who are united to one  
 and the fame head, denote the fo gathering together of things in Heaven  
 and things on Earth, as to make them all one and the fame body. Which  
 will be render'd yet more evident, if it need to be fo, by confidering  
 what St. Paul affirms but juft before <sup>m</sup>, that God did therefore make <sup>m</sup> — 9.  
 known to us the mystery of his will, that fo he might make that collecti-  
 on whereof he fpeaks. For as we cannot in reafon underftand St. Paul  
 there of any other mystery of Gods will, than the mystery of the Gofpel,  
 and which the Scripture elfewhere affirms to have been hid <sup>n</sup> from ages <sup>n</sup> Col. 1. 26.  
 and generations, yea even from the Angels themfelves (for otherwife  
 there is no reafon why they fhould fo defire to pry <sup>o</sup> into it ;) So neither <sup>o</sup> 1 Pet. 1. 12.  
 can we think, fupposing the mystery of Gods will to be the mystery of  
 the Gofpel, but that the gathering together afterwards fpooken of, and  
 for which that mystery is faid to be made known, is into the Society of  
 the Church; this being manifefly the end of the promulgation of the  
 Gofpel, and therefore no lefs ftrongly proving that to be the gathering  
 together before fpooken of. And here very opportunely comes in the ex-  
 plication of a parallel place of St. Paul <sup>p</sup>, and which, though not without <sup>p</sup> Col. 1. 20.  
 its obfcurity, yet will give light, even by that obfcurity, to the matter  
 we have now in hand; that I mean where it is faid, that it pleased the  
 Father that in Chrift fhould all fulnefs dwell, that fo having made peace  
 by the blood of his crofs, he fhould reconcile all things to himfelf by  
 him, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven. For as no  
 man can fuppose the Angels not to be among the things in Heaven, when  
 but juft before <sup>q</sup>, where he makes the fame divifion, he annumerates to <sup>q</sup> Col. 1. 16.  
 the things in Heaven thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers;  
 fo affirming God to reconcile to himfelf the things in heaven as well as  
 thofe on earth, as that too by the blood of our Saviour's crofs, he gives us  
 yet more clearly to underftand, that the gathering together elfewhere  
 fpooken of is into that Church, which Chrift reconciled and purchafed  
 by

\* Rev. 22. 9.

\* — 19. 10.

Angels of  
prophecy of  
— Gospel.

by his blood: Because, as the Angels cannot be suppos'd to be capable of a proper reconciliation, as having not offended against the Divine Majesty, so no other reason therefore can be given of St. Paul's affirming God to *reconcile to himself the things in heaven as well as those on earth*, than their being gathered by vertue of his blood into that Church, which as to all the natural members of it stand in need of a reconciliation, and do accordingly find it there. That of the Angel to St. John I shall put a period to those proofs which are intended to shew those blessed Spirits to be members of the same Society with us. For when, saith that Apostle, *I fell a second time at the feet of that Angel who had made me so many glorious discoveries, he took me off from it by telling me, see thou do it not, for I am not only thy fellow servant, but the fellow servant of thy brethren the Prophets* (or, as he elsewhere expresseth himself, of those that have that *spirit of Prophecy*, which is the *testimony of Jesus*) and in fine of all *those that keep the sayings of this book*, For how comes that Angel to stile himself the *fellow servant* of this Apostle and others that had that *testimony of Jesus*, but that he and others of his order were of the same Christian family with them, and help'd together with them toward the enlightning of it? How much more, to stile himself the *fellow servant* of all *those that should keep the sayings of that book*, but that he look'd upon himself as a member of the same Society with them, and so oblig'd to join with them in the service of their common head?

Col. 2. 19.

\* Rev. 6. 11.

Such evidence there is of *their* being members of the Church; who may seem, by reason of their different nature, to be farthest removed from it; How much more may we think those *spirits of just men* to be so, which were sometime undoubted members of it, and are now advanc'd to a more near union to their and our head Christ Jesus? For considering the more near union those persons have to the head of this body, this membership of theirs may seem rather improv'd than impair'd; The union of any person to the head Christ Jesus being the foundation of that membership according as St. Paul declares: It being *from this head* that *the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God*. Besides, when upon the cry of the Souls under the altar, *How long Lord holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood upon them that dwell on the earth*; When, I say, Answer was made them thereupon that they should *rest yet for a little while till their fellow servants* \* *also and their brethren, that should be killed as they were, were fulfilled*, what scruple can remain of their continuing members of that Society, of which they were when they lived here? The answer there given not only calling those on earth by the name of their *fellow-servants and brethren*, but commanding them to expect the *full privileges* of that Society, till those their fellow-servants and brethren should come to *partake with them* thereof.

III. It appearing from the premises that Angels and Saints departed are members of the same Societies with us, it remains that we declare the communion there is between us and them, and first of all between us and the Holy Angels.

In order whereunto, conformably to our defining the Church to be a *Society of persons called both to the privileges and obedience of the Gospel*, we must distinguish of a double communion, that is to say a  
passive



passive and an active one. A passive communion I call that, whereby persons become partakers of the common priviledges of that Society, to which they do equally appertain. And in this sense I suppose we are to understand St. Paul where he saith <sup>x</sup>, that the Corinthians were called by <sup>x</sup> 1 Cor. 1. 9. God unto the fellowship or communion of his Son Jesus Christ; partly because he speaks before of their coming behind in no grace or gift of <sup>7.</sup> his, and partly because in the words immediately preceding <sup>8.</sup> he professeth it to be his hope that God would confirm them in them unto the end; as who could not think otherwise when he considered the faithfulness of that God by whom they were called into the fellowship, or communion, of him. For what assurance could either that faithfulness or call of God be of his confirming the Corinthians in those graces they had receiv'd, but as it imported a readiness in him to continue to them those Christian graces to the participation whereof he had invited them, and which therefore must be suppos'd to have been that very communion of Christ, to which they are affirmed to have been called? Now that there is such a communion between us and the Angels as imports a participation of the like benefits, will need no other proof than their partaking alike of the death of Christ the fountain of the Churches happiness; It being by this (as we learn'd before) that God hath reconciled all things to himself whether they be things in earth or things in heaven. And certainly were it not that the holy Angels because such cannot be suppos'd to be capable of any proper reconciliation, this communion of theirs in the death of Christ would be easily digested by all those who have a due regard either for St. Paul, or for his writings. But as it is not at all to be wondred, that being to express the benefits of Christ's death, he should make use of such a word as had a more peculiar reference to the generality of the Society, and indeed to all that are natural and proper branches of it; so that consideration, and the common interest that heavenly and earthly things are said to have in it, perswades therefore the looking out for some particular benefit which the Angels may be suppos'd to reap by it. Which, according to the usual and not unreasonable determination of Divines, is a stability and permanency in that grace wherewith they are endu'd, and in the favour and blessing of God. For as however the word reconcil'd do not agree to the Angels in its full latitude, yet it is but reason to take so much of it in, as may appear to be agreeable to them, and therefore also their partaking in some measure of Gods favour, because that is included in it; so especially such instances of it, as they may be suppos'd to stand most in need of, to whom this reconciliation is attributed: Our own great need of a reconciliation being that which moved God to send his Son to die for our sins, and to reconcile us to himself. Now forasmuch as it is but reasonable to believe, upon the account of the word reconcil'd, that the Angels tasted so much of Gods favour, as was either agreeable to them, or necessary for them; forasmuch as it was not only very agreeable to their condition, but, considering their possibility of falling, necessary also, to be established by God in that grace and favour wherein they were; It is equally reasonable to think, that God for the merits of his Son, to whom he had given them, did so settle and establish them, that they should not be any more in a possibility of falling from that grace and favour in which they were created by him. Thus how different soever the manner of the Angels and our Communion may be as to the death of Christ and the favour of God, yet

yet we agree thus far in it, that both of us partake of each, as that too, agreeably to our respective conditions, and the necessities we have to serve by them.

<sup>a</sup> Act. 2. 42.

Of the passive Communion that is between us and the holy Angels, what hath been said may suffice; enquire we now, as the nature of this and all other Societies perswades, after an active one, or a communion in the same offices and duties. In which sense as the word Communion is generally taken in the Scripture, so it is in all reason to be, where it is said of those that were converted by St. Peter, that they *continued steadfastly in the Apostles doctrine and fellowship* <sup>a</sup>, or communion, *and in breaking of bread and in prayer*: That is to say, they communicated with them in the same religious offices, they join'd with them in their devotion and service. Now this Communion is again double, agreeably to that double duty which is incumbent upon the members of this Society; a communion in such duties as respect God and Christ the heads of this Society, or in such as respect the members of it. That the Angels have a communion with us in such duties as respect God and Christ, we learn from the mouth of that Angel before whom we affirmed St. John to fall down and worship, but who was taken off from it by saying, *See thou do it not for I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus, worship God*. For these words do not only shew that the Angels and we are of the same Society, but that there is a communion between us and them in that duty we owe to God and Christ, and that the Angels look'd upon themselves as no less obliged to the performance of it. And indeed considering that God hath made Christ their head as well as ours, and put even these *principalities under him*; considering that the same God hath given him a name <sup>b</sup> above every name, and to which every knee in heaven and earth is reverentially to bow, and every tongue confess that he is the Lord, it cannot be doubted, but that the Angels, who are ever obedient to Gods will, are conformable to this instance of it, and communicate with us in the adoration of our Saviour. In fine so close is the Communion between us and the Angels in the adoration of God and Christ, that they may very well be presum'd not only to do the same duties, but to join with us in the doing of them. For if (as there is great reason to believe, and I shall accordingly endeavour to shew) these Angels be present at our assemblies, then may they be suppos'd, because fellow-servants of the same God, and members of the same Society, to join with us in our devotions, and *Angels and Archangels with us, and we with them laud and magnifie Gods glorious name*, according as our Liturgy <sup>c</sup> hath express'd it. From a Communion in duty toward God and Christ, proceed we to that which respects the members of the Society, and which may be diverse according to the different duties we owe to each other; but cannot be better compris'd, than St. Paul may seem <sup>d</sup> to have done it, in the rejoicing at the happiness or honour of each other, or where that is wanting, a compassion of each others condition, and an earnest study and endeavour to procure the amendment of it. That the former of these is no less common to the Angels than us our Blessed Saviour <sup>e</sup> sufficiently intimates, where he tells us that *there is joy in the presence of the Angels over any one sinner that repenteth*. For though they are not themselves capable of repentance because without sin, though they cannot therefore experimentally know what is the happiness thereof, yet as they are not ignorant of the blessed effects

<sup>c</sup> Communion service.

<sup>d</sup> 1 Cor. 12. 26.

<sup>e</sup> Luc. 15. 10.

effects of it in men, so being members of the same Society with them, they rejoyce at it, and account of their happiness as their own. But neither are they less concern'd at the want of any happiness in us, or less solicitous to procure the amendment of our condition. For is it any part of that solicitousness to attend upon him from whom every good gift cometh, and with the silent oratory of their looks bespeak a mercy for Christ's little ones? Our Saviour tells us <sup>f</sup>, that these holy persons *the Angels do always behold the face of their father which is in heaven.* <sup>f</sup> Mat. 18. 10. Again, is it any part of that solicitousness actually to go about so profitable a work, and carry glad tidings of good things to such members of this Society as want them? The *Author to the Hebrews* instructs us <sup>g</sup> that *they are all ministering Spirits sent forth to minister to them, which shall be heirs of salvation.* <sup>g</sup> Heb. 1. 14. Lastly, is it any part of that solicitousness to present themselves at our Assemblies, to take notice of and represent our pious demeanour unto God? The former of these is fairly deducible from that well known place of *St. Paul*, where he admonisheth the *Corinthian* women in the publick Assemblies *to have a vail over their head or face* <sup>h</sup> *because of the Angels.* <sup>h</sup> 1 Cor. 11. 10. For as it is but reason to take this and other such like texts of Scripture in their most obvious and literal sense, unless there be something in them to enforce another understanding of them; So especially, when, as *Mr. Mede* hath observed <sup>i</sup>, we have not only an assurance of God and Christ's <sup>k</sup> being present in our Assemblies, but the Scriptures of the old Testament to bear witness that God presented himself to men by these his heavenly ministers, and the belief both of the Jewish and Christian Church to assure the presence of those Angels at their meetings. Which suppos'd, as there will be no doubt of the Angels being to be understood here, and therefore neither of their being present at the Assemblies of Christians, or taking notice of their demeanour there; So that observation of theirs persuades their likelihood to represent it, and if it be such as becomes the members of the Church, with favour and advantage. Thus it is but reasonable to believe that the Angels hold communion with us in all the offices of love and service, and thereby approve themselves faithful members of this Society; it remains that we also (for the word *communion* imports a reciprocation) be as careful to maintain a Communion with them again: Not (as hath been of late both advis'd and practis'd) by praying to them, or performing other such like instances of divine adoration; for this doth rather destroy than preserve the communion, because advancing the members into the place of the head; Nor yet by putting up any petitions to God for them, whatsoever they may do for us, because always *beholding the face* of that God *in whose presence is fulness of joy and happiness*; But which will be the best and most rational expressions of our love and communion with them, rejoycing at their happiness, and imitating them in their chearful and ready obedience to God's will, according as our Saviour hath taught us to pray <sup>l</sup> we may. <sup>l</sup> Mat. 6. 10.

The Communion that is between us and the Angels being thus accounted for, and thereby so much of the present *Article* dispatch'd; proceed we to consider of that, which is no doubt the principal intendment of it, even the communion there is between us and the Saints departed. Where again we will look upon it both as a *passive* and an *active* one, a communion by which we become partakers of the same priviledges, and a communion by which we partake in the same duties.



1. As to the former of these most certain it is *first*, that they do partake with us of that spirit, by which we are sanctified, and that too in a far greater measure. We learn thus much from the title that is given to those *Spirits of just men*, unto whom we are affirmed by the *Authour of the Hebrews* to come, at the same time we make our approach to *mount Sion and the heavenly Jerusalem*. For being made *perfect*, as that Authour assures, they must consequently be suppos'd to be replenished with that Spirit, from whom all perfection is, as that too, in a greater measure than the members of the Church militant are. It is no less certain *secondly*, that they partake with us, of that remission of sins, which is one of the great privileges of this Society, as because of that *perfection* which is before attributed to their State, and which cannot be thought to be in any tolerable measure a perfection, if it fall short of ours; so because of that *judgment* I have elsewhere <sup>m</sup> shewn them to have already pass'd, and their being bestowed thereupon in a place of bliss and happiness: Such an award proving *à fortiori* the doing away of those sins, the wages whereof are nothing but misery and death. It is no less certain *lastly*, that they partake with us in the hope of that full inheritance which the last great judgement shall award; as being not only replenished with that Spirit of God which is *the earnest* <sup>n</sup> of our inheritance, but receiving in themselves the happy first-fruits of it.

<sup>m</sup> Explication of those words, From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

<sup>n</sup> Eph. i. 13, 14.

2. From that Communion which is passive, pass we to that which is active, even a Communion in the same duties; where again we will consider it as to those which respect God and Christ, and as to those which respect the members of the Society. That we are not without the company of the Saints departed in the former of these, several passages of the Revelations do sufficiently assure us; the cry of these no less than of the Angels being, *Worthy is the lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing* <sup>o</sup>; and again, *Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the lamb for ever and ever*. Thus the Scriptures teach us, that the Saints departed adore their Maker (for surely though those voices were represented to St. John only in a vision, yet they were intended to him and us as representations of the true) and thus too the Church tells us *the glorious company of the Apostles, the goodly fellowship of the Prophets, and the noble army of martyrs* do; And well they may when we are assur'd, that the *Spirits of those just men* are *made perfect*, and replenished with piety and glory. For from whom may this adoration of God be expected, if not from those whom God hath so highly advanced, and replenished with all the graces of his spirit? But because whatever doubt there may be concerning the *Communion of Saints*, yet there is not for ought I know any controversy concerning *this branch* of it; therefore apply we our selves rather to the consideration of that communion, which is conversant about those duties which respect the members of this Society. Where again I will enquire what this communion is on the part of the Spirits of just men made perfect, and then on our parts toward them. If question be made concerning that communion which is on the part of *Spirits of just men made perfect*, so it is not to be doubted *first*, that they have the same or a greater love for the members of the Church on earth than they had whilst they were here themselves. For as it is the property of the members of that body, by which St. Paul sets forth the state of Christ's, to have

<sup>o</sup> Rev. 5. 12, 13.

have an affection and kindness for each other, and consequently this must be suppos'd to be in the Saints departed, inasmuch as they are members of it; so must that love of their's be suppos'd rather to increase than diminish, because their graces also do, of which *love* is not the least considerable. It is no more to be doubted secondly, because the obligation of every member of a Society, that they do, as much as in them lies, endeavour the welfare of those who are members of the same body, and consequently (because that is in their power) that they pray for the state of Christ's Church militant here on earth. But whether they pray only for the Church in general or at most for the several orders of men in it, or pray also for particular members, the Scripture hath not told us; and therefore we must be content to be ignorant. The utmost that can with any certainty be affirmed is, that so far as the necessities of particular Christians are known to them, so far their prayers also are put up in their behalf. But whether or no, or how far the necessities of particular Christians are made known to them we are in the dark, and must be contented to be so, till we arrive at the same state of perfection. Leaving therefore any farther consideration of the Communion that is upon the part of Saints departed, enquire we what communion there is or ought to be on ours; to recompence this their concernment for us. And here in the *first* place, I shall not doubt to represent, as equally obligatory to us, the having a love for them again, and so repaying that affection which they afford us; the members of this body being particularly oblig'd to have that affection for each other, and consequently for all those that are alike members of it. I shall make as little scruple to affirm *secondly*, that we ought to have an equal esteem for them, because of that honour to which they are advanc'd; for how should we not honour those whom God and Christ so signally have? But this still with such an honour, as doth not entrench upon the others, and with proper and apt expressions of it. Of which nature is first a decent interment of their bodies, and committing them to the ground with all becoming respects; these being a part of those who are now glorified Saints, and which as they have heretofore communicated with the Spirits of those just men in all holiness and piety, so shall hereafter be admitted again into their Society. For which cause the Ancient Church (as may appear from the Epistle of that of *Smyna* <sup>p</sup> concerning the death of *Polycarp*) did not doubt to express this honour by *communicating with the sacred body* of the deceased. Of the same nature is secondly, a respectful mention of them, because falling within that honour which is properly humane; Which makes it the more strange that any man should scruple, yea not be forward to prefix the title of *Saint* or other such honourable one before the names of those who were certainly such. Though when all is done there is not a *better* or more *advantageous* way of honouring them than by proposing their examples to our own or others imitation: This as it will be not a little for our own profit, so being not unlikely at the last great day to add to the glory of their crown, and therefore no doubt the highest honour we can give them. I place not in the same rank the praying at all unto them, or presenting them with other acts of Divine Honour: Partly because such testimonies of honour were not only unknown to but expressly disavowed by the An-

<sup>p</sup> Vid. Euseb. Eccl. Hist. li. 4. c. 15. Ὁ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς καὶ βασιλικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐκτετακέναι τὴν γένεσιν τῶν δικαίων ἐπετήδειον ὡς μὴ δὲ τὸ σωματικὸν αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἐπιδομαίνοντων ταῦτο ποιήσιν, καὶ κοινωσὶν τῷ ἀγίῳ αὐτοῦ σκήρει.

<sup>a</sup> Eccl. Smyrn. Epistola ubi loquitur de eis qui videbantur sibi vereri, ne relicto Christo, Polycarpi cadaver adorarent—ἀγνοῦντες (sunt verba epistole) ὅτι ἡμεῖς καὶ χεῖρὸν ποτὶ καταλιπὼν διησίομεθα, καὶ ὑπερὶ τοῦ πάντος κόσμου τῶν σωζομένων σωτηρίας παθόντα, ἡμεῖς ἐτερον τινα σέβειν. τῶτον αὖ γὰρ ἦν ὅσα τὰ θεῷ προσκυνοῦμεν, τὰς δὲ μαρτυρίας αἱ μαθηταὶ τῶν κυρίων καὶ μισθῶν ἀπαύδων αἰῶνι, ἐνεκα εὐνοίας ἀνυπερβλήτης τῆς αἰς τὸ ἰδὼν βασιλείας καὶ διδασκαλίας, &c. Euseb. Eccl. Hist. li. 4. c. 15. Quis autem audivit aliquando fidelium stantem sacerdotem ad altare, etiam super sanctum corpus Martyris ad Dei honorem cultumque constructum, dicere in precibus, Offero tibi Sacrificium Petre vel Paule vel Cypriane? Cum apud eorum memorias offeratur Deo, qui eos & homines & martyres fecit, & sanctis suis angelis caelesti honore sociavit. August. de Civ. Dei. li. 8. c. 27. \* Office for burial. † Communion Service. ‡ 1 Cor. 12. 26.

<sup>a</sup> Eccl. Smyrn. Epist. de Martyrio Polycarpi. Ἐνθα αἱ δυνατόν ἡμῶν συναρμώσεις ἐν ἀγγελίᾳ καὶ χαρᾷ—(eo nempe in loco ubi ossa Polycarpi condita sunt) παρῆεν δὲ κυρίως ἐπιτελεῖν καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν αὐτῶν ἡμέτερον γινώσκοντες, ἡμεῖς τε τῶν περὶ ἀληκτότων μνήμων, καὶ τῶν μαλλόντων ἀσκήσιν τε καὶ ἐτοιμασίαν. Euseb. Eccl. Hist. li. 4. c. 15.

<sup>a</sup> Vid. Glossar. Spelmani & Meursii.

cient Church<sup>a</sup>, but chiefly because they are so far from being proper testimonies of our Communion with them, that it is in effect the setting the members in the place of the head, and acknowledging them rather as our Lords than brethren. But to return to those which are more proper testimonies of our Communion, and wherein we may not only no way offend against the head of this Society, but approve ourselves to him by our apt communion with his members; where in the *third* place I shall represent as a legitimate instance of it, our rejoicing and giving thanks to God for that signal happiness to which the Saints departed are now advanced: This as it is the custom of the *English Church* over all those that die in the Communion of it, yea over *all those that have departed this life in Gods faith and fear*, so is no more than what our being members of the same Society doth oblige all Christians to; It being affirmed of the members of that body<sup>†</sup> to which St. Paul requires the body of Christ to conform, that *if one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it*. Conformably to which rule, when any person anciently suffered for the cause of Christ, and thereby gave a clearer proof of his becoming one of the Saints in glory, it was customary for the Church<sup>‡</sup> to make the Anniversary of that day a *Festival*; celebrating it with all the expressions of a Christian joy for that happiness to which the Martyr was admitted, and styling it the martyrs *birth-day*. And upon the same ground in part it was, that in later times the Church had its *Diptychs* or tables of two leaves a piece<sup>\*</sup>, in the one whereof were the names of such famous persons as were still alive, and in the other a like catalogue of such as were departed in the Faith; at the recital of whose names the people were

wont to make this acclamation, *Glory be to thee O Lord*. Which custom is so much the more to be stood upon, because over and above that proof which the former *Doxology* affords us of the Ancients praising God for the happiness of the deceased, and together therewith of the pleasure they themselves took in it, agreeably to the notion of their being members with them of one and the same body; the very rehearsal of those names which the *Diptychs* contain'd, may seem to have been particularly intended as a testimony of their holding communion with those, whose names they did so recite. Witness that rehearsal having

<sup>†</sup> Dionys. Areopag. πρὸς ἐκκλησίαν. Ἱεροσολ. cap. 3. August. de Civ. Dei. li. 22. cap. 10. ut & Vales. in Not. ad Evagrii Eccl. Hist. li. 4. cap. 11.

<sup>‡</sup> Dionys. Areop. ubi supra.

<sup>\*</sup> Cod. de summa Trinitate. Leg. Cognoscere volentes. Paragr. Nullus itaq; Vid. etiam Valesium loco citato.

<sup>a</sup> Sgvropol. Hist. Concil. Florentini. Sess. 12. cap. 8.

place in the *Communion Service* of the Church, and from which they were so careful to banish all that were not full members of it; Witness its coming immediately after<sup>‡</sup> the giving the *kiss of peace* to each other, as if it were to declare the like communion with those, whose names they did recite, and that they intended that as a kind of *kiss of peace* unto them also; Witness farther their inserting those

<sup>‡</sup> *Councils* into the *Diptychs* wherewith they professed to

agree both as to doctrine and censures; As in fine, their not mentioning any person in that *leaf* of them, which contain'd the names of those that were alive, who was not<sup>b</sup> in Communion with them. For these are suf-

ficient



ficient presumptions of their believing themselves oblig'd to maintain Communion with those Saints whose names they recited out of them, yea that they intended that rehearsal as a testimony thereof. I will conclude this *Article* when I have alledged *fourthly*, that forasmuch as the Saints departed are but partially happy by reason of that power which death yet hath over their bodies; therefore it must be look'd upon as one necessary part of that Communion which we profess to have with them, to pray that God would hasten the resurrection of the dead for their and our perfect redemption: That so the Spirits of just men made perfect may once more have communion with their bodies, and our bodies and spirits a more intimate communion with theirs, and with that head to which they are so straitly conjoin'd.

## The forgiveness of Sins.

### The Contents.

*After an account of the nature of forgiveness of sins, which is shewn to be no other than the release of that Obligation to punishment, which sin as such induceth upon the committer of it, enquiry is made into the extent of that forgiveness which Christianity proposeth, both as to those sins to which it is appli'd, and as to those punishments from which it delivereth. The former of these more minutely considered; and the forgiveness here asserted shewn to extend to sins committed before and after Baptism, to greater as well as lesser; and in fine to all unless it be the Sin against the Holy Ghost, the nature whereof is therefore enquir'd into. The same forgiveness considered with reference to those punishments from which it delivers, and shewn to extend to the release of eternal punishments; but not with the same certainty, or in the same measure to the release of temporal ones, especially where the sin to be forgiven is great and scandalous. A brief account of the means whereby God was dispos'd to grant the forgiveness here asserted, and a transition from thence to the consideration of the terms upon which it is propos'd, one of which is shewn to be our becoming members of the Church, and continuing in the communion of it.*

**I** Have hitherto insisted on such *Articles of the Creed*, as, strictly and properly considered, are the objects of our *belief* only; it remains that we descend to those which are also the objects of our *hope*, and for the obtaining whereof we are the more willing to believe the other. Amongst which as *the forgiveness of sins* is the first both in nature & time, and accordingly so placed in the *Creed*, so is it in reason to have the pre-  
cedency in our discourse, because designing an explication of it. Now there are four things to be enquir'd into, in order to the explication of this forgiveness (for of the being of the thing it self neither the *Creed*, nor the *Scripture* will suffer us at all to doubt.)

The for-  
giveness  
of Sins.

1. What

1. What forgiveness of Sins is, and wherein it doth consist.
2. Of what extent the forgiveness here asserted is.
3. The means whereby God is dispos'd to grant it.
4. The terms upon which it is propos'd to us.

I. For the apprehending the first of which we are to know, that as *sin* is in its own nature *the transgression* <sup>a</sup> of a law, and (because all other laws receive their strength from his) of some law of God; so it doth *eo ipso* oblige the committer of it to suffer punishment for it, if he against whose law it is committed, will be pleas'd to inflict it: This being but the necessary consequent of the neglect of a former obligation, even that by which he stood oblig'd to give obedience to God's laws or commands. For if it be in the power of God to lay his commands upon his creatures (as what may not be suppos'd to be in his power over those who owe their very being to him?) there must also be suppos'd to be an obligation in those creatures of his to yield obedience to his commands: All power to command supposing an obligation to obey in him who is subjected to it. Which obligation though it be not the same with that obligation whereof I now speak, even an obligation to suffer punishment for the transgression of God's commands, yet will necessarily infer it where it self is not complied with. For it being in the power of him who hath a right to command to punish the transgressions of those commands, as without which all Authority would be vain; it must consequently be but the just obligation of him, who transgresseth, to suffer punishment, if he against whom he offended will be pleas'd to inflict it. Thus the general reason of mankind teacheth us to argue, neither doth, or can any man, who thinks himself to have a power to command, not think also that it is in his power to punish the transgression of those commands, and the obligation of him, who transgresseth them, to suffer punishment for it; And conformably thereto (as in all other things) the Scripture doth both reason and discourse; calling sins for that reason by the name of *debts* <sup>b</sup>, and those who commit them *debtors*. For that this is the true reason of that appellation our Saviour plainly shews, where he represents God's forgiveness and ours, or rather our neglect of it under the *parable* <sup>c</sup> of a certain King, who though he gave command at first for the selling of a servant of his and all that he had for non-payment of a sum he ow'd, yet did, upon his submission, release him from that hardship, till he came to understand that that very servant had for a far less sum took a fellow-servant of his by the throat, and cast him into prison. For it appearing from that parable that that King's *loosing* his servant from the hard necessity of bondage was the very <sup>d</sup> *forgiving him* his debt, as again by the opposition that is there made between the King's <sup>e</sup> and his Servants act, as well as the application of it in the <sup>f</sup> close, that that servants *casting his fellow-servant into prison* was the *not forgiving of his*; And it appearing farther that this parable was made use of by our Saviour to represent God's and our forgiveness <sup>g</sup> of those sins, which he elsewhere stileth debts, and the forgiveness of them the forgiveness of debts; Our sins must consequently be look'd upon as entitled debts, because like debts *properly* so call'd they oblige him <sup>\*</sup>, who did not satisfy his first obligation, to suffer condign punishment for it. Which

<sup>b</sup> Mat. 6. 12.  
comp. with  
Luc. 11. 4.  
<sup>c</sup> Mat. 18. 23.

<sup>d</sup> — 27.

<sup>e</sup> — 32, 33.

<sup>f</sup> — 35.

<sup>g</sup> — 27. &c.

\* Terrall. de  
Oratione, c. 7.  
Debitum autem  
in Scripturis delicti figura est, quod perinde iudicio debeat, & ab eo exigatur, nec evadat iustitiam exactionis, nisi do-  
netur exalio, sicut illi servo dominus debitum remisit. Nam & quod idem servus a domino liberatus, non perinde parci-  
bitur suo, ac propterea delatus penes dominum, tortori delegatur ad solvendum novissimum quadrantem, id est modicum usq;  
delictum, eo compitit quod: emittit nos quoq; propterea debitoribus nostris.

suppos'd,

suppos'd, as it will follow, (because forgiveness is no other, than the release of that debt) that it consists in the freeing of us from our former obligation to punishment; so it seems to me to be without reason; that we should not think the *Greek* word <sup>h</sup> we render forgiveness to be sufficiently expressive of that design: Because though that word, and its respective correlates be in themselves capable <sup>i</sup> of other senses, yet they do not appear to be otherwise us'd when appli'd to *debts*, under which notion it is (even when our Saviour speaks of the forgiveness of sins) that he represents those sins of ours, as again that forgiveness of them as the forgiveness of debts. However that be, most manifest it is from the general acception of the word *forgiveness*, and the former *parable*, that as sin obligeth the committer thereof to suffer punishment; so forgiveness of sins is nothing else than the taking off that obligation, as that too (because that obligation ariseth from the neglect of a former one) by him whom we were obliged to obey, and consequently also (because that obligation was to God) by *him* and *him alone*.

<sup>h</sup> Ἀφεσις ἀμαρτιῶν.

<sup>i</sup> Grot. de Satisf. Christi. c. 2. pag. 66. &c.

II. An account being thus given of the nature of that forgiveness which we are now in the explication of, our own proposed method and the weightiness of the thing obligeth us to consider of the *extent* of it; where again I will enquire to what sins this forgiveness is extended; and what punishments thereof it delivers the guilty person from. For as for the persons to whom it reacheth, we shall find a more proper place, when we come to shew upon what terms it is propos'd.

1. To begin with the former of these, even what *those sins* are to which this forgiveness is extended; towards the resolution whereof it will contribute not a little to observe that the expression both in the *Creed* and in the *Scripture* <sup>k</sup>, where this matter is entreated of, is generally *indefinite*, and neither confineth it self to any one sort or sorts of sins, or excludes any from the benefit thereof. For though an indefinite proposition be not in it self equivalent to an universal, unless where the matter of it is necessary, which it is certain the matter of this proposition is not (it being no doubt in the power of God to forgive one sin and not another, because under no obligation to forgive any) yet cannot this proposition of *the forgiveness of sins* be deemed to exclude any but what that Gospel, which proposeth it, shall be found *expressly* to exclude. The word *sins*, the forgiveness whereof is here and in the *Scripture* promised; equally comprehending *all*, and consequently not to be limited to any sort or sorts of them, unless that Gospel, which promiseth it, doth. Whatsoever sins therefore shall not be found *expressly* excluded from pardon, all those are to be suppos'd to be included in the *forgiveness* here specif'd, and consequently that all whatsoever are, if they be not particularly excluded. Now though by what hath been said a compendious way is opened to the resolution of the difficulty propos'd, all that is incumbent upon us to enquire into being, whether the Gospel hath excluded any one sin from forgiveness, and; if it hath, what that sin is; yet because it may tend not a little to the quieting of troubled minds, and not less to the commendation of the mercy of God in it, I will, before I proceed to the resolution of that question, instance in some of those many sins of the forgiveness whereof we are assur'd.

<sup>k</sup> Act. 5. 31.  
— 13. 38.  
Eph. 1. 7.

And here in the *first* place I shall not at all scruple to affirm, that that forgiveness which the *gospel* promiseth and the *Creed* proposeth, extendeth to those sins which are committed both *before* and *after* our conversion



<sup>1</sup> Act. 2. 38.  
<sup>20</sup> — 39.  
 — 10. 43.  
 Rom. 3. 25.

tion unto Christ. That it extendeth to those sins which are committed *before* our conversion, is evident from the Apostles proposing it to the unconverted Jews <sup>1</sup> and the heathen world <sup>20</sup>, and calling upon them to be baptiz'd for the remission of them. For as they could have no other sins to be forgiven but the sins of their unregenerate estate, who were not as yet gotten out of it; so that, which they are invited to, in order to the forgiveness of them, shews them to have been as yet in it; Baptism being the means of our initiation into Christ, and consequently shewing those to have as yet no interest in him, who are invited to partake of it. And of this forgiveness and of the availableness of that Sacrament to the procuring of it the Ancient Church was so perswaded, that many, who were come so near to it as to be in a readiness to enter into it, did therefore defer the receiving of Baptism till their death-bed, called from thence the *Clinici*. Whereby though it is true they became guilty of a great error, and I no way doubt gave occasion to the following one of *Novatus*, as who, by thus deferring of their Baptism, seem'd to have little confidence of the forgiveness of those sins which were committed after it; yet as all error is founded upon some truth and gives a farther light to that truth upon which it is built, so this of the *Clinici* doth more strongly confirm the both efficacy and fulness of that *forgiveness of sins*, which respects our yet unregenerate estate. For what temptation could men be under to defer so salutary a thing as Baptism, were it not that they were well assur'd that the *forgiveness* which it brought was both so full and so efficacious, that for the sake thereof it was not only behooful to defer the sense of so great a benefit, but which is more run the hazard of being taken off by death, before they could procure the bestowing of it. But because the forgiveness of those Sins which were committed *before* our conversion is a grace of which there was never yet any doubt, neither, so long as the Scriptures or the Creed do abide, can we well think there ever will ( for the Creed being primarily propos'd to those who were to be baptiz'd, doth perswade at least the forgiveness of those sins which were committed before it ) therefore proceed we to consider of the forgiveness of those sins which are committed *after* it, and so much the rather because the forementioned *Novatus* gave occasion to the questioning of it, and thereby also to a lamentable Schism in the Church. In order whereunto I shall alledge *first* a petition of that prayer, which is commended by our Lord himself to our daily use. For being that

<sup>n</sup> Mat. 5. 1, 2. prayer is a part of that Sermon of his which was directed to Disciples <sup>n</sup>, and ( as appears by many clear <sup>o</sup> expressions in it ) intended for the regulation of those who were at least converts to his religion; by teaching them to pray *daily* for the *forgiveness* of their sins, it must consequently imply a possibility of falling into them, and obtaining the forgiveness of them; Especially when the same Lord of ours doth *assure* that forgiveness <sup>p</sup>, if we perform that condition upon which he teacheth us to beg it. The same is no less evident *secondly* from the institution of the *Lord's Supper*, a privileged and duty both peculiar to such as are already Christians. For being this Sacrament is also an instrument of the forgiveness of sins as the story of the institution of it shews ( our Saviour, immediately after *drink ye all of this*, adding <sup>q</sup> *for this is my blood of the New Testament, which was shed for you, and for many, for the remission of sins* : ) The proposing of it to such as are already Christians shews the sins committed by them to be capable of the same pardon and forgiveness,

<sup>o</sup> — 13. 14.  
 16.

<sup>p</sup> Mat. 6. 14.

<sup>q</sup> — 26. 28.

forgiveness, with those of unregenerate men. In fine, to establish us so much the more fully in the belief both of these sins and their forgiveness St. John joins himself with those he wrote to, who yet were undoubtedly Christians (for otherwise surely he would neither have given them the title of *Brethren* nor told them that they had *heard* the Christian doctrine *from the beginning*) but notwithstanding that, I say, he joins himself with them in the number of those, who, if they should say, they have *no sin*, would be found to be *liars*, but withal, who, if they did *confess* them, would find God ready enough to *forgive* them, because obliged thereto by his own *promise and fidelity*. 1 Joh. 2. 7.  
1 Joh. 1. 8. 9.

But because it may be said that this and the forealledged Texts are to be understood only of *smaller* sins, or if of *greater*, yet of such as men are rather *surpriz'd into* than *fall deliberately* (for even *Novatus*, or rather *Novatianus* himself levell'd his censures at those who, during the time of persecution, were prevail'd upon to sacrifice to Idols) and because it hath been thought that even he did not absolutely deny pardon to them, but only that the *Church had no remedy at all* for them; lastly, because the Scriptures themselves speak hardly of those who fall away from their pristine Piety and Faith: Therefore, not contenting our selves to shew in the *general*, that sins *after Baptism* are not incapable of forgiveness, consider we *secondly* of such sins as are more *notorious and deliberate*, as that again with respect to the *pardon* that may be had for them *in the Church*, and by those instruments which God hath deposited in it. For I demand first of all what sense these severe men will put upon those words of St. Paul, *Brethren if any man be overtaken in a fault, ye, which are spiritual, restore such a one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself lest thou also be tempted*: for supposing, if it were only in compliance with our own *Translation*, that we are to understand St. Paul of such sins as men fall into by surprize, yet must we also understand him of such as were otherwise heinous enough, and for which they were in some measure separated from the Society of the Church; there being not otherwise any ground for a restoration of them by such *spiritual persons* as were also *Governours of the Church*, or indeed for any caution to do that *in the spirit of meekness*. For what fear could there be of fierceness, where the Sinner, to be restor'd, had been guilty of some ordinary failing, and which good as well as bad men are often ensnared by? But because it is not so clear what the *fault* understood *there* is, nor yet what the *restitution* of the committers thereof, or the *persons* by whom; therefore put we the same question concerning a text which is yet more clear, and indeed may seem to contain in it, a full proof of that forgiveness, which *Novatus* took upon him to deny; That I mean which the incestuous *Corinthian* was guilty of, and with whose both excommunication and absolution St. Paul hath so fully acquainted us, or at least with his own readiness to proceed to both. For was it of a sin of a lesser nature that St. Paul there speaks, nay doth not the same St. Paul tell us that it was such a *fornication* as was not so much as named among the *Gentiles*? And is not that a proof of its being a sin of a deep dy, nay doth not the thing it self prove it, and St. Paul's command to *deliver him to Satan* for it? Is it not farther evident, that as it was in it self of a very heinous nature, so it was such also as into which he could not well be supposed to be surpriz'd (for men do not ordinarily take any Wives without all deliberation) but which however he continued in after leisure

enough for it, and no doubt not without all regret from his own Conscience, or admonitions from others? Was it not such lastly, notwithstanding all this, to which there was place for *forgiveness* upon the incestuous persons repentance, yea which St. Paul did not only *forgive* <sup>b</sup> in the person of Christ but prompted the *Corinthian* Governours to *forgive* <sup>c</sup> also? For what is this but to say that as forgiveness is not deny'd even to notorious Sinners when they repent, so the Church is furnished with sufficient Authority to impart it, yea cannot acquit her self of her duty to God without so doing? As indeed well may we so opine, when the procuring of this forgiveness may seem to have been the chief design of St. Paul's and that Churches excommunicating him; the intent of his *delivery unto Satan* being indeed *for the destruction of the flesh*, but withal that, by that destruction, *his spirit might be sav'd*, and therefore much more forgiven, *in the day of the Lord Jesus*. Lastly, as this incestuous *Corinthian* met with forgiveness for his offence, yea receiv'd it by order of St. Paul and from the hands of the Church, so though others of them had fallen into so great a degree of impiety, as to be *drunk* <sup>d</sup> at the Celebration of that great mystery of our Religion the *Lords Supper*, or at least at that Feast of Charity which attended it, yet were even they invited again to the receiving of it <sup>e</sup>, having first prov'd and *examined* themselves; yea with this farther encouragement, that if they would *judge themselves* <sup>f</sup> they should *not be judged*, that is, in other terms they should be *forgiven*. The only thing therefore to be accounted for unto *Novatus*, is the forgiveness of those persons who may seem to have been wholly estranged from that piety which they formerly profess'd, and either in words or fact renounc'd that faith which begets it. A thing the rather to be enquir'd, because the *Author to the Hebrews* seems to be as decretory, as he who made use of his words to maintain his own severity.

<sup>g</sup> Heb. 6. 4. &c. For it is impossible, saith that Author <sup>g</sup>, for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gifts and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, If they shall fall away to renew them again unto repentance: seeing they crucifie to themselves afresh the Son of God, and put him to an open shame. As in like manner afterwards <sup>h</sup> to the same purpose, that if we sin wilfully, after that we have receiv'd the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall consume the adversaries. But as it is not unusual either for the Scriptures or other writings to pronounce of that as impossible which is only exceeding difficult, or if impossible, which is but naturally such, or in the ordinary dispensations of Gods grace (for thus after that our Saviour had by a proverbial expression among the Hebrews represented it as such <sup>i</sup> for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven, yet he took care to add that it was rather impossible *with men* <sup>k</sup> than God) As, I say, therefore it is not unusual to pronounce of that as impossible, which is only exceeding difficult, or, if impossible, which is but naturally so, and in the ordinary dispensations of Gods providence; and consequently the *Author to the Hebrews* might so call it impossible to renew those to repentance, who fell away after so great an illumination: So he, that shall consider what was said to the Churches of *Laodicea* and *Sardis*, will not think fit to take those words in the highest sense they are capable of; Our Saviour inviting the Church of *Sardis* to <sup>l</sup> repentance, and consequently also to pardon, even after he had said that she

*had*



had a name to live <sup>m</sup> but was dead, and counselling the Church of *Laodicea* (which yet was so sinfully *lukewarm* as that he himself professed to wish that she were rather <sup>a</sup> stark cold) that she would buy of him <sup>a</sup> gold tried in the fire, and white rayment, yea be zealous <sup>p</sup> and repent. And indeed as it is not to be imagin'd, that, where that repentance is; it should not also be followed by forgiveness; partly because repentance hath so often the promise of forgiveness, and partly because it is not to be thought God would give so great a grace to those, to whom he means not as willingly to vouchsafe the other: So it is not unworthy of remark, that where *the Author to the Hebrews* speaks so severely of the condition of those that fall away, he founds not the desperateness thereof upon the want of forgiveness either in God or in his Gospel, but upon the impossibility there seems to be in *renewing them to that repentance* to which forgiveness is annexed; Thereby intimating; that if that repentance could or should appear, forgiveness would not be wanting to them; neither should it therefore be lawful for any to despair of their pardon, or for the Church not to admit them again to the participation of those means, by which forgiveness was appointed to be convey'd. So that hitherto no sin can appear, which is wholly excluded from that forgiveness, which the *Creed* obligeth us to expect. If there be any Sin so excluded, it is that which is commonly call'd the *sin against the Holy Ghost*, and upon our Saviours declarations concerning which we cannot well impose so favourable a sense, as we but now did upon those of *the Author to the Hebrews*. Wherefore I say unto you, *All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall never be forgiven unto men*, no not either in this world, or in that which is to come. For (as the same Jesus goes on) *whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him, but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come*. For the resolution of which very difficult text that which hath been said by some not unlearned men is, that, when our Saviour saith it shall never be forgiven, his meaning is that it shall very difficultly be done, and that neither without a repentance, which is proportionable to the demerit of it. I for my part will not go about to impugn that interpretation, nor yet define any thing positively concerning it. All I shall say is, that that seems not to be the meaning of it, because St. John, where he speaks of sins that men should pray and obtain pardon for, tells us withal that there is a *sin unto death*, and for which he did not say that they should pray. Leaving therefore that interpretation as unsatisfactory, I shall choose rather to enquire what that sin is which is affirm'd shall never be forgiven: And which, if we consult the foregoing words, we shall find to be no other than a knowing and malicious ascribing that to the Devil which was the undoubted work of God's Spirit. Our Saviour (as appears from the Story <sup>1</sup> here referred to) <sup>1</sup> had healed one who was blind and dumb, and cast out that devil, which was the cause of both. This (as we learn from the sequel of it <sup>1</sup>) was so far from inciting the Pharisees to give glory to God and Christ, that they affirm'd of this latter, that he did not cast out devils but by *Beelzebub the Prince of the devils*. Whereupon when our Saviour had alledged several arguments to shew <sup>a</sup> that what he had now done could not be the effect of any other than the *Spirit of God*, to let them know that that calumny of theirs was as pernicious as it was groundless, he proceeds to tell them, that,

<sup>m</sup> Rev. 3. 1.

<sup>a</sup> — 15.

<sup>p</sup> — 18.

<sup>p</sup> — 19.

<sup>1</sup> Mat. 12. 31, 32.

<sup>1</sup> Joh. 5. 16.

<sup>1</sup> Mat. 12. 22.

— 24.

— 25, &c.

however it might fare with other blasphemies, yet the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost should never be forgiven to them; that is to say (for so the coherence of those words perswades) such as the Pharisees were guilty of, in ascribing that to the devil, yea to the chief of them, which was evidently no other than the work of God's spirit. Now there are two things (as was before intimated) which are observable in that Blasphemy, which was the object of our Saviours censure, a *knowing and wilful* affront to the Spirit of God, and such as is also *malicious and despiteful*. I call it a *knowing and wilful* affront to God's Spirit, not only because of the ill character which is generally given of the Pharisees, but because I find St. Paul, though a Blasphemer, obtaining pardon by reason of that *ignorance* \* and *unbelief* which was the ground of his offence, and because it is afterwards affirmed here, that he *who should speak a word against the Son of man should be likely enough to find forgiveness*, but he *that should speak a word against the Holy Ghost should not*. For how comes our Saviour to distinguish between speaking against the Son of man and against the Holy Ghost (when it is manifest that the Pharisees spake immediately only against the former) were it not that the Pharisees did not only know him to be the son of man, but a man actuated by the Holy Ghost, and consequently also that the works of that Son of man were his? But so also do I think my self oblig'd to call this *Sin against the Holy Ghost* a *malicious and despiteful* affront to the Spirit of God, as well as a *knowing and wilful* one. For how can that be suppos'd to be without a great degree of malice and despite, which doth knowingly and wilfully confound him, who is the greatest and best of beings, with that which is the most vile and abominable? This, as it is in it self one of the greatest affronts that can be offered unto God, so being therefore such, which we cannot think any man can wilfully license himself in, who is not push'd on to it by a malicious mind; A calumnious tongue being ever the effect of a rancorous heart, and which would proceed to worse effects, if it had to do with such a being, as were capable of receiving any injury by them. And if the *latter* † of the forementioned texts of the *Author to the Hebrews* be to be drawn to that sin which seems altogether irremissible (which I am apt, upon second thoughts, to think it may) it is upon the account of that *despite to the Spirit of Grace*, which that Author presently after \* seems to charge it with. And for such sins as those, I had rather caution men against, than give them occasion to believe that there is any pardon for them. But as this will be no relief to the doctrine of the *Novatians*, which excluded those from pardon, who, in times of persecution, sacrificed to Idols, and who may for the most part be presum'd to have fallen into it, rather through fear of punishment, than out of any propensity of will to it, or despite to God and to his Spirit; So I cannot think for the reasons before mentioned, that other than such *wilful and despiteful* affronts could be that sin which our Saviour censures, or may be thought to be exempted from the benefit of that forgiveness, which this *Article* encourageth us to expect.

2. There being now no doubt to be made to what *sins* this forgiveness extends, and so far therefore the extent thereof considered and accounted for, it remains that we enquire of what extent it is as to those punishments thereof which it delivers the guilty person from. For it appearing from the Scripture that sin doth not only bind us over to punishment, but to a *temporal* and *eternal* one, there will be place for enquiry

\* 1 Tim. i. 13.

† Heb. 10. 26, 27.

\* — 29.

enquiry whether the forgiveness here propos'd delivers us from each of these, or at least whether it infallibly and absolutely doth. That it takes us off infallibly and absolutely from the latter of these, and thereby gives sufficient comfort to those who are partakers of it, we have not only for a proof those many texts which assure us of *eternal life* (for what place could there be for eternal life, if our obligation to eternal punishment were not before taken off?) but, which is more, an assurance of being delivered *from the wrath to come*<sup>a</sup>, even that to which the damned are consign'd; such a delivery as that proclaiming our guilt to be so far taken off, as it binds us over to eternal punishment. The only difficulty in this affair is as to *temporal* and *present* ones, though not so much neither as to their being taken off for the main, but as to the manner wherein they are, and the measure in which. For when the Scripture doth so often assure us of that *forgiveness of sins*, which we have said in its own nature to take off the obligation to punishment; when, where it speaks of this forgiveness, it speaks of it in *indefinite* terms, and without limiting the effect of it to this or that sort of punishment; when, in fine, he, by whose death this forgiveness was procur'd, underwent it as well to remove *temporal* as *eternal* punishments, as St. Matthew's<sup>a</sup> applying that saying of *Isay*<sup>b</sup>, *Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses*, to our Saviours curing of *bodily distempers* shews; He must offer a manifest injury to that *forgiveness of sins* which the Gospel tenders, who doth not allow it to take off *for the main* our obligation to *temporal*, as well as to *eternal* punishments. And indeed neither are the present sad circumstances of many of those, who are undoubtedly forgiven, any bar to that effect of the forgiveness of sins, which we are now in the establishing of: Because though the evils do abide, yet they may no longer be as punishments, as being sent by God for other and more merciful ends, and with which the other doth not at all intermix. Only as when men consider this forgiveness as to those sins it cancels, they do not think themselves oblig'd, by the indefiniteness of the terms wherein it is delivered, to say that all sins are the object of it (for the sin against the Holy Ghost is by many of them accounted otherwise) so they have therefore no reason to bar other men from enquiring, whether that forgiveness doth *infallibly* and *absolutely* take off our obligation to temporal punishment. For if forgiveness of sins, how generally and indefinitely soever delivered, may admit of a limitation as to one sort or sorts of sins; why not also as to the removal of that obligation, which we have said it to be intended for; especially when the great and chief obligation of sins is acknowledg'd to be removed? If there be any thing that can be fairly alledg'd against this inference, it must be the want of as clear and express Scripture for this limitation, as it seems to them there is for the other. But beside that I cannot apprehend, how that temporal death, which was threatned as a punishment, should not in some measure continue such upon all on whom it falls; when it is the affirmation of St. Paul<sup>c</sup>, that as *death enter'd by sin*, even the sin of him to whom it was immediately threatned, so it *hath pass'd upon all men for that all have sinned*; What can we say, that may be *satisfactory* I mean, to that signal passage of *Nathan*, where, after he had told *David* that God had *put away*<sup>d</sup> his *sin*, neither should he *die* for it, he adds by way of abatement of that forgiveness, *Howbeit*<sup>e</sup>, *because by this deed thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, the child*  
also

<sup>a</sup> 1 Thes. i. 10.

<sup>a</sup> Mat. 8. 16, 17.

<sup>b</sup> Isay 53. 4.

<sup>c</sup> Rom. 5. 12.

<sup>d</sup> 2 Sam. 12. 13.

<sup>e</sup> ——— 74.



also that is born of thee shall surely die. For who can look upon that as other than the remains of Gods displeasure, and consequently as other than a punishment, which is threatned with as much shew of indignation, as the evils before remembred were, and when there was as yet no appearance of *David's* repentance to assail them? However therefore men may upon their repentance promise themselves the forgiveness of sin, so far as that obligeth to eternal punishment, and temporary also as to the main, yet I cannot see how, when their sins are as scandalous as this of *David's*, they can be confident of such a forgiveness, as shall cancel both the one and the other obligation. For, so far as we are able to judge, *David* himself was not thus forgiven; and he, who can fettle such a persuasion in his mind, may perhaps find it to be of use to him in restraining him from such offences, as may be of so pernicious consequence to himself. For well may we be afraid of the commission of those sins which are not wholly forgiven, even when they are.

III. To the nature and extent of this forgiveness subjoin we the means by which God was dispos'd to grant it, the third thing propos'd to be enquir'd into; Though for this we shall need rather to refer to the foregoing ones, than to enter into a new discourse concerning it. It may suffice here to say, that God was dispos'd to this forgiveness by the satisfaction that was made to his justice by the death of his Son for those sins which he was so to forgive. The name of *Jesus*, in which we before profess'd to believe, doth in part shew it, as whose design it was to let us know that he should save Gods people from their sins. His anointing to his Priesthood, as hath been exemplifi'd in the word *Christ*, shews it more, because declaring him to have been consecrated thereby to offer up that body which God had given him, as a propitiatory sacrifice for our sins. Lastly, his death and passion shews it, because undergone for us and for our sins, yea represented as a price paid to the Divine Justice for the redemption of us from eternal torments. All which having been before insisted on in their proper places, I shall forbear the farther prosecution of it, and proceed to that, which I propos'd in the last place to discourse of, even the terms upon which this forgiveness is propos'd to us.

IV. It hath been very well observ'd by those that have commented upon the Creed before me, that, though this Article at present hath no necessary connexion with that of the Church, yet Antiently it ran thus, *I believe remission of sins, and everlasting life by the Church*. The footsteps of which connexion are still preserv'd in the Creed of our Communion service; when concerning Baptism, which the Church dispenseth, it teacheth us to profess, *I believe one Baptism for the remission of sins*. Which being granted, it will follow that, by the doctrine of the Creed, one of the terms, upon which forgiveness of sins is propos'd to us, is our becoming members of the Church. And surely, whatever right they may have to alledge it, in whose mouths it is so frequent that out of the Church there is no Salvation, yet, if understood with reference to the universal Church, it will be found to have perfect truth in it, whether we do consider that Salvation as to the inchoation of it, as to its nutrition and continuance, or as to the restauration of it. For to begin with the first of these, even the inchoation of our Salvation, and so also (for therein doth Salvation especially consist) of the forgiveness of sins; Who is there but must acknowledge the truth of that known saying

laying of St. Cyprian, <sup>f</sup> that *that man cannot have God for his father, who hath not the Church for his mother*? I do not mean only upon the account of that *new birth*, which Christianity requires in order to the capacitating us for so great a privilege (for that might perhaps be rejected as an expression purely metaphorical) but upon the account of that concurrence, which is on the part of the Church toward the producing of it. For is that *new birth*, whereof the Scripture speaks, and without which there is no forgiveness, perform'd any other way than by the womb of the Church? Is it not by her *fecundity* (as the same St. Cyprian <sup>e</sup> speaks) that we come to be thus born, as well as from her milk that we receive nourishment, and are animated by her breath, or rather by that Spirit of God which actuates her? If not, how comes St. Paul to affirm concerning this Church (for of her it is I have elsewhere <sup>h</sup> shewn him to speak) when representing her under the title of the *Jerusalem that is above*, he tells us <sup>i</sup> that she is the mother of us all? This, as it could not be affirm'd unless it were by her that we were conceiv'd and born, so being manifestly St. Paul's intention, because not only comparing her to that mother by whom Abraham <sup>k</sup> had Isaac, but inferring from his former affirmation that we are the <sup>l</sup> children of her. The same is yet more evident from that sacrament by which we are regenerated, and which is ever propos'd, together <sup>m</sup> with faith and repentance, as the means of obtaining forgiveness. For being the administration of Baptism was deposited in the hands of the Church, as our Saviour's commission to the Apostles of going and baptizing all nations shews, that forgiveness, which is annexed to it, must be look'd upon as so far forth confined to the Church, and consequently the *inchoation* of it at least not to be had but by the means of it. From the inchoation of this Salvation or forgiveness therefore pass we to the *continuance* of it, and enquire whether that also be not to be obtain'd by the means of it; which that it is we have in part the foremention'd Sacrament of Baptism to assure us. For if by it we are baptiz'd into this body of Christ the Church, as well as in the name of the head of it, as St. Paul <sup>n</sup> first, and that faith which we now explain <sup>o</sup> shews; our continuance in that salvation and forgiveness is in reason to depend upon our continuing united to it, as well as to its head Christ Jesus. Though if we desire a farther proof of it, the same St. Paul will furnish us therewith, where he tells us <sup>p</sup> that though this body receive nourishment from its head, yet it is as knit together, and by means of those joints and bands by which the members thereof are united to the head and to one another. For if the nourishment, which this body receives, be received by it as a body, and through the intervention of certain joints and bands which connect the members thereof to one another and the head, then must they fail thereof who are not connected to this body, and particularly to those joints and bands. Which what they are, or at least especially, the same St. Paul doth elsewhere instruct us, where he tells us <sup>q</sup> that this head of ours gave Apostles, and Prophets, and other such persons, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, and (which comes yet more home to our present purpose) for the edifying of the body of Christ. For what material, or (considering the words <sup>r</sup> that follow) only verbal difference is there between the edifying the body of Christ and bringing us all to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ, which is here made the office of the Apostles and other Ecclesiastical persons, and the nourishing and encreasing

<sup>e</sup> De unitate Eccles. scilicet. 5. Habere jam non potest Deum patrem, qui Ecclesiam non habet matrem.

<sup>h</sup> De unit. Eccl. ibid. Illius setui nascimur, illius lacte nutri-

<sup>i</sup> mur, spiritu ejus animamur.

<sup>k</sup> Explicat. of those words,

The holy Catholick Church.

<sup>l</sup> Gal. 4. 26.

<sup>m</sup> ——— 22.

<sup>n</sup> ——— 31.

<sup>o</sup> Act. 2. 38.

<sup>p</sup> ——— 22. 16.

<sup>q</sup> 1 Cor. 12. 13.

<sup>r</sup> Tert. de Bapt. c. 6. Quum autem sub tribus

& testatio fidei,

& sponsio salutis pignorentur,

necessario ad-

ducitur Ecclesie

mentio, quoniam ubi tres,

id est Pater & filius & spiritus sanctus, ibi

Ecclesia que trium corpus est.

<sup>s</sup> Col. 2. 19.

<sup>t</sup> Eph. 4. 11,

12.

——— 13.

ing with the encrease of God the same body of Christ, which in the place before alledged is made the office of those *joynts* and *bands*. And though there be not any exprefs mention, that I know of, of Christ's depositing in the hands of the Church or the Governours thereof the ministry of the *Lords Supper*, which yet must be confess'd to be one of the most proper means for the nourishing of us, and conveying our pardon to us; yet when I can find the *ministers of Christ* entitled *Stewards of the mysteries of God*, of which the *Lord's Supper* is one of the chiefest; when I can find farther both by our *Saviours commission* and *their own pretensions* that they were entrusted with the power both of *retaining* and *remitting sins*, for which last the Sacrament of the *Lords Supper* was principally ordain'd; I think it but reasonable to conclude, that that Sacrament was also deposited with it, and consequently that, as we owe the *inchoation* of our Salvation and forgiveness to the Church, so we must owe the *continuance* thereof to it, because entrusted with that Sacrament by which it is especially convey'd. All therefore that remains for us to shew is, that, if we happen to *forfeit* this forgiveness (as there want not sins which will despoil us of it) the Church must be our *remedy* for that also, neither can we expect the *restoration* of it but from her hands. A thing not difficult to be believ'd by those who consider our Saviour's assuring that Church, whereof we speak, that *whatsoever* that should bind *on earth* should be bound in heaven, as on the other side that *what* that should loose should be loosed also there; his assuring his *Apostles* in particular, in whom the power of the Church was vested, that *whosesoever sins they remitted they should be remitted unto them*, and *whosesoever sins they retained should be indeed retained*; in fine (which may serve both for the clearing of that commission, and a farther confirmation of it) St. Paul's warranting the Church of *Corinth* to bind and retain the incest of him who had married his fathers wife (for so their *delivering him up to Satan*, and loosing him afterwards from it by *forgiving* him persuades) as again upon his repentance to *forgive* him in their own, *his*, and *the name of Christ*. For this is a sufficient proof, that, if we despoil our selves of God's forgiveness, we must be restor'd to it by her ministry and sentence, from whose hands we first received it, and afterwards continu'd to enjoy it. But from hence it will not be difficult to collect what those persons get, or rather lose, who either cut themselves off from the Church, or are rightly cut off by it; who withdraw their children from the partaking of one of its Sacraments, or themselves from the partaking of the other. For if they be at all forgiven by God, it is more than either we can promise them, or they promise to themselves; there being no just presumption of their receiving that or any other benefit from God, who seek it not in that way by which he hath appointed to convey it.

I insist not at all at present, how necessary soever in order to our forgiveness, upon *repentance towards God*, and *faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ*; Because these will find a more proper place in the doctrine of the Sacraments, to the right participation whereof they are as necessary as to the other. It may suffice here briefly to note, that as *faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ* cannot but be look'd upon as necessary to forgiveness, when order was given that that forgiveness or remission should be preached in his name, yea affirmed, that *there is no other name whereby we can be saved*; So we are not to look upon that repentance,

<sup>f</sup> 1 Cor. 4. 1.

<sup>g</sup> Joh. 20. 23.

<sup>h</sup> 2 Cor. 2. 10.

<sup>i</sup> Mat. 26. 28.

<sup>j</sup> Mat. 18. 18.

<sup>k</sup> Joh. 20. 23.

<sup>l</sup> 1 Cor. 5. 5.

<sup>m</sup> 2 Cor. 2. 7--10.

\* Quest. *what is requir'd of persons to be baptiz'd?*  
Ans. Repentance whereby they forsake sin; and faith, &c.

Quest. *what is requir'd of them who come to the Lords Supper?*  
Ans. To examine themselves whether they repent them truly of their former sins — have a lively faith,

<sup>n</sup> Luc. 24. 47.

<sup>o</sup> Act. 4. 12.



penitance, which is alike requir'd, as a thing which rests in the Soul, or expresth it self only in a few sighs and tears, but rather as such, which must also produce a change in our wills and affections, yea influence our future works and actions. St. Peter's <sup>f</sup> addition of conversion to repentance perswades the former of these, for *repent ye therefore* (saith he) *and be converted that your sins may be blotted out*; St. Pauls shewing both to Jews and Gentiles <sup>g</sup> that in order to their receiving of the forgiveness of sins <sup>h</sup> as well as an inheritance, they must repent, and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance, perswades both the one and the other: How much more then our Saviour's declaration, that mens sins are forgiven proportionably <sup>i</sup> to the degrees of their love unto himself? <sup>j</sup> Yea that unless they themselves shew the like love and forgiveness to their brethren <sup>k</sup>, neither will their father which is in heaven forgive them their trespasses against himself? For what more could have been said to proscribe that easie and ineffectual repentance, which men of ill principles, or worse lives have endeavoured to advance? Such are the terms upon which forgiveness of sins is offered, and not unlike therefore must be the belief and behaviour of those who expect to be made partakers of it. Otherwise that forgiveness of sins will not only not become their portion, but the belief thereof serve so much the more to encourage men to persist in them, and so debar them of that benefit, which, had it not been for so crude a conception of it, they might not only have believ'd, but enjoy'd.

<sup>f</sup> Act. 3. 19.

<sup>g</sup> — 26. 20.

<sup>h</sup> — 18.

<sup>i</sup> Luc. 7. 47.

<sup>k</sup> Mat. 6. 15.

# The Resurrection of the Body.

## The Contents.

Of the great reproach as well as unbelief, wherewith this Article was at first entertain'd, and enquiry thereupon made into the due importance of it; which is shewn to be no other than the rising again of those very bodies, wherewith we are now clothed, and which we shall at length deposite. This evidenced to be the sense of the Creed from the terms wherein it hath been or is now express'd; from the consentient belief and practice of the Church, more particularly in the solemnity of their funerals, as also from the behaviour and discourses of the Churches enemies. Of the possibility of that resurrection which the Creed asserts, whether as to the restoring of the body to its pristine condition, or giving life and breath to it after it is so restor'd. What evidence there is from reason, but more especially from Scripture of the futurity of such a resurrection, and the objections that are made against it produc'd and answer'd. Of the time when this resurrection shall be, and who shall be the subjects of it.

### The Resurrection of the Body.

<sup>a</sup> Euseb. Eccl. Hist. li. 5. in Proem.  
<sup>b</sup> Euseb. ibid. c. 1.

<sup>c</sup> Euseb. ibid.

**W**Hen in that great persecution in France, which hapned under Antoninus Verus<sup>a</sup>, the heathen had, but in vain, attempted to suppress Christianity by the tortures and death of the professors of it; they thought at length of a way which they suppos'd would not only add farther terrour to the living, but deprive the dead also of that hope in expectation whereof they were content to be tortured and die: Even by reducing the bodies of the several Martyrs to ashes<sup>b</sup> and scattering them in the river *Rosne*. For (as Eusebius tells us out of the Epistle of the Churches of Lyons and Vienna<sup>c</sup>;) this they did, as supposing themselves thereby able to defeat God, and deprive the Martyrs of their resurrection; that so (as they said) they might not have so much as the hope of a resurrection, in confidence whereof they had brought in a new and strange worship, and despising all calamities had gone with readiness and chearfulness to their death: Adding withal in the same vain-glorious strain, let us now see whether they shall rise again, and whether their God can help them, and deliver them out of our hands. I easily believe they spake their own thoughts, and such as their reason as well as indignation suggested to them. For who can think otherwise, when he finds the Philosophers of Athens receiving the doctrine of the resurrection<sup>d</sup> with the same contempt? Nay when he finds the Corinthians<sup>e</sup> and Thessalonians<sup>f</sup>, even after their conversion to Christianity, putting St. Paul to the trouble of laying that foundation anew among them? In fine when it doth appear, that that piece of infidelity is not as yet cur'd, neither have all St. Paul's labours been able

<sup>a</sup> Act. 17. 32.

<sup>e</sup> 1 Cor. 15. 12.

<sup>f</sup> 1 Thes. 4. 13.

14.

able to free men from those scruples, which their own reason shall I say; or rather inconsideration of the great power of God hath suggested to them? Otherwise certainly, after the natural importance of the word, the clear doctrine of the Scripture, and the avowed as well as constant belief of the Church concerning it, a resurrection would have signified somewhat more than the giving men a body, but whether the same with that they deposited, or any other, is not at all material. Being therefore in the process of my discourse arriv'd at that Article which bears the title of the *Resurrection of the body*, I will see whether I may not be able so to clear and establish it, as that neither the wanton wits of men may be able to turn it from its native sense, nor infidelity, (provided it be also conducted by reason) find any thing in it to impugn it.

Now there are five things which will be necessary to be enquir'd into to procure us that both clear apprehension of, and establishment in it which we seek.

1. What kind of resurrection is here intended?
2. Whether such a resurrection be really possible?
3. What evidence there is either from Scripture, or reason of the futurity of it?
4. When this resurrection shall be, and
5. Who shall be the subjects of it?

I. I intimated but now in the *preamble* to this discourse, that there were those who thought the doctrine of the resurrection might be salv'd by the reunion of the Soul unto a body, but whether the same which it deposited, or any other, was not at all material. How well this notion agrees with the *Scripture*, for the salving whereof it was especially intended, shall be considered in its place; but that it agrees not at all with the *Creed*, the *terms* wherein this Article is or hath been delivered, the *belief and practice* of that *Church* whose this Creed is, yea the *behaviour and discourses* of the *enemies*, of both shew. For doth not a resurrection, in the proper and literal importance of it, imply *the rising again of that which fell*, and consequently therefore when appli'd to a dead body, the rising of that body which died? And can we then understand the *Creed* of any other resurrection than that? Can we fancy to our selves any less strict, or less proper interpretation of it? For be it that the word *resurrection* may be capable of a laxer sense; be it that it may sometime import no more than the erecting of a pile of building in the place where there stood one before, whether made of the same or other materials; Yet as it must be acknowledged that expressions so appli'd are rather figurative than proper, so that alone will be enough to reasonable men to shut such an interpretation of them out of the *Creed*: For who can think that men of ordinary prudence would make use of figurative expressions in the penning of those *Summaries*, which were not only design'd to convey the knowledge of the most material truths, but convey it too to those who for the most part are apt to take things in the literal sense, yea cannot well judge when words are to be taken in their literal sense, and when again in an improper and figurative one. Thus, I say, it is but reasonable to argue from the nature of that *Creed*, wherein this resurrection is delivered: How much more then when the same *Creed* useth the very same word or its relative concerning *his* resurrection, which all men acknowledge, and must to be a

*Resurrectionis vocabulum non aliam rem vinctum dicat quam que cecidit.*  
Tert. adv. Marc. li. 5. c. 9.

*Ἀναστὰς ἐν τῷ παρῶν, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ Χριστοῦ resurrectionis loquuntur; οὐκ ἐκ ἀδανεισμένων, ὅτι ἐκ τῆς ἡμετέρας.*



strict and proper one. For though the Compilers of the *Creed* might perhaps fancy, that men would be so wise as to take the word here in such a sense as was most agreeable to their natural conceptions, and therefore also in a less proper, if that were most agreeable to them (which yet the generality of wise and unwise hath not hitherto done;) yet could they entertain such an opinion, when they made use of the same word before in its strict and proper sense concerning that resurrection, which was confessedly both the cause and exemplar of this? On the contrary they may seem rather to have determin'd men to the same understanding of it; partly, because making no distinction in their expression, which had been but reasonable, if the resurrections were really distinct, and partly because men are apt to believe a similitude between the effect and its cause, the transcript and that of which it is so. And indeed, however the inability of apprehending such a resurrection, as we speak of, hath made men fancy to themselves another, which is more easie to conceive; yet their contending so eagerly as they do to save the identity of the person risen with him who fell, by the identity of the Soul which actuates him, shews them not to be without some jealousy of the truth of that notion we contend for. Only they forget that the *Creed*, as it were to obviate this fantastick sense of theirs, hath not stil'd it, as they would have it, the resurrection of the *person*, but the resurrection of the *flesh* or *body*. Which shews plainly enough, that this resurrection is to be understood especially as to the body, and not as to the person whose it is. I may not here omit, though it were singular in it, the Church of *Aquileia*'s both expressing this Article by the *resurrection of this flesh*<sup>i</sup>, and prompting men at the same time they repeated it, to make a cross upon their foreheads. For as this was indication enough of their believing a restitution to the very same bodies, in which they dwelt here, and afterwards deposited; so it was such a singularity, as we cannot find to have been any where condemn'd, and may therefore reasonably believe to have been the sense of those Churches that used it not, as which otherwise it is not unlikely they would have been forward enough to condemn, especially in a *Creed*, which is or ought to be the same in all.

But not any longer to insist upon the *terms* wherein this Article is, and hath been express'd, when there are other *reasons* to judge of the sense thereof by; consider we in the next place the *belief and practice* of that Church whose this *Creed* is, and which cannot but be thought to be a competent proof of the meaning of it. Though for the former of these again (because I love as little as may be to meddle with things which I find done to my hands) I shall choose rather to refer my reader to a *discourse*<sup>k</sup> where it may be found, than to enter into a minute account of it. It shall suffice me to observe from thence, that the *Fathers of the Church* (and by whose belief we may guess at the persuasion of the rest) that they, I say, believ'd, and taught, that the *bodies of men at the last resurrection shall be as truly the same with those they died in, as the bodies of those, whom our Saviour rais'd when he was upon earth, were with those in which they died*; that they believ'd and taught a resurrection of that body which fell into the earth, as being led thereto by the sense of the word which was no other than the rising again of that which fell; that they believ'd and taught the resurrection of that body which was corrupted, and dissolv'd, and changed into earth; that none but infidels would

say

<sup>i</sup> *Ruffin. Expos. in Symb. Apost.*

<sup>k</sup> Dr. Beaumont's observations upon Dr. Moors Apology for his Mystery of Godliness, cap. 4. p. 37, 38.

say that there should be no resurrection, nor any but misbelievers, that any other body should rise, than that which slept; that if the body do not rise, neither can the man be said to rise, because man is not the soul alone, but soul and body; in fine, that, as Christ rose with his former flesh, and bones, and members, so we also after the resurrection shall have the same members which we now use, the same flesh and blood and bones. Which passages shew plainly enough, what kind of resurrection they believ'd, and what therefore we are in reason to think to have been the sense of that Creed, by which they regulated their faith, and which they profess'd to embrace and explain. But of all the proofs that can be produc'd of a general belief of the Church, and so also of the sense of that Creed which regulated it, there seems to me to be none more full and convincing, than a general and consentient practice, as therefore neither of the Churches belief concerning the resurrection of the body, than the great care and expence they were at in the embalming or enterring of the bodies of their dead; To say nothing at all of the religious rites that were perform'd at the enterring of them, and of which I have given some account before<sup>1</sup>. For was it, that this care and charge of theirs was not extraordinary, and that therefore no argument at all could be formed from it? But *Tertullian*<sup>m</sup> assures the heathen, and in them us, that the rich spices of the *Sabeans* were more prodigally spent (for so he expresseth it) in the burings of Christians than they were by the heathen in the incensing of their Gods: Yea the heathen in *Minutius Felix* owns that they were not unemploy'd at their funerals. Was it then that the Christians did it out of a principle of vanity, and to procure some honour to themselves, by the thus adorning of their dead relations bodies? But no men were ever more free from any thing of vanity in their own persons, which certainly they would not have been, if that humour could have prompted them to be so lavish about their dead. The only cause that can be assign'd of it is, that they themselves believ'd, and were willing to perswade others, that as those bodies had been the temples of the Holy Ghost, and so not unworthy of their regard, so they should afterwards be so again, and have a joyful and happy resurrection. Which is rather to be believ'd, because they were not at such expences about the bodies of those Saints when alive, as knowing them to be then sufficiently illustrated by their own virtues, and the esteem that was had of them, but thought that only a proper time, when death had raviſh'd their souls from them, and strip'd them of all glorious circumstances. For then it seem'd but reasonable to do somewhat to take off that scandal which death had brought them under, and let the world see by sensible experiments that, how inglorious soever their present condition was, yet they did not look upon them as things lost, but which should one day recover out of it. And indeed as it is not improbable that the embalming of dead bodies and other the like cares about them had their original from the belief of a resurrection, and were accordingly adviſ'd by *Democritus* for that end as *Grotius*<sup>n</sup> tells us out of *Plinie*; so it is apparent enough from the writings of the Christians, that they had that end among others in it, and intended them as testimonies of that belief. For thus St. *Augustin*<sup>o</sup>, after he had premis'd some texts of Scripture which consign to us the decency

<sup>1</sup> Explication of those words, The Communion of Saints. <sup>m</sup> Apologet. cap. 42. Tura plane non emimus. Si Arabia queruntur, scient Sabaei pluris & cavioris suas merces Christianis sepeliendis profigari, quam diis fumigandis.

<sup>n</sup> De jure belli & pacis li. 2. cap. 19.

<sup>o</sup> De civitat. dei li. 1. cap. 13. Verum ista

authoritates non hoc admovent, quod inſit illis cadaveribus ſenſus, ſed ad Dei providentiam, cui placent etiam talia pietatis officia; corpora quoque mortuorum pertulere ſignificant, propter ſalem reſurrectionis aſſumendam.



of funerals, makes this following remark upon them. *But these Authorities shew not that there is any sense in carcases, but that even the bodies of men belong to the providence of God, whom such officers of piety please, and for a confirmation of the belief of a resurrection.* To the same purpose though more clearly as well as Poetically doth *Prudentius*

<sup>a</sup> Hymno 10, circa exequias defuncti.

*Hinc maxima cura sepulchris  
Impenditur, hinc solutus  
Honor ultimus accipit aytus,  
Et funeris ambitus ornat.*

*Candore nitentia clavo  
Prætere linteæ mos est,  
Adpersaq; myrrha Sabæo  
Corpus medicamine servat.*

*Quidnam sibi saxa cavata,  
Quid pulchra volunt monumenta?  
Nisi quod res creditur illis  
Non mortua, sed data somno.*

discourse. For hence, saith he, even from the belief of a resurrection is it, that such care is bestow'd upon sepulchers, hence that the persons deceas'd have that last honour and pomp of funerals, in fine that, as the Custom is, they are cover'd over with fine white linnen, and their bodies preserv'd by as well as anointed with spices. And again in the verses immediatly following: *What mean those hollowed stones, and beautiful monuments, but that the thing which is committed to them is rather asleep than dead?* Since therefore they, who were not wont to be so lavish in other things, were at great expence both of

money and care in the embalming and interring the bodies of their dead; since it appears both by probable arguments, and their own accounts of it, that they did it to declare their own belief of the resurrection of them, and prompt others to the same belief of it; It is easy to see, that, whatever is now thought, the Church of old believ'd such a resurrection of the body, as would restore them those very bodies they deposited, as well as furnish them again with such. For how improper had it otherwise been to bestow such cost upon those bodies, which, for ought they knew, might not be any ingredient either of those persons whose bodies they sometime were, or of any other humane ones?

I will conclude my account of the sense of the present *Article*, when I have represented the consentient belief and behaviour of those who were either strangers or enemies to the Christian faith. For if the doctrine of the resurrection had not been such as we have describ'd it, why did the heathen so bogle at, and deride it? Why was it one of the last things they receiv'd into their belief? nay why did those, who had been so far prevail'd upon as to embrace Christianity, intimate so much dissatisfaction in this article, as to put *St. Paul* upon the necessity of laying that foundation anew? There being no great difficulty to believe, that God, who had given the soul a body before, might if he pleas'd, give it a body again, and so far therefore put it into the same circumstances it was in before. Though, when all is done, that which in this particular doth most perswade the Christians belief of the rising of those very bodies which they should deposite, was the instance before mention'd of the heathens reducing the bodies of their Martyrs to ashes, and scattering them in the river *Rosne*, thereby to defeat that resurrection which they expected. For to what purpose that inhumane Artifice of theirs, if those Christians, whom they thus serv'd, expected not the rising again of those very bodies wherein they suffered, and which they accordingly to defeat them of, took care thus to dissolve and dissipate them?

II. It being sufficiently evident, as I suppose, that the resurrection of the body here spoken of is to be understood with reference to that very body which we deposite, enquire we in the next place into the possibility thereof. Where again, because that resurrection, whereof we speak, is no other than the restoring of the body to its pristine frame and life by the re-union of its Ancient Soul, we will enquire whether it be possible

to



to God (for to other than him we do not pretend to ascribe it) to bring the body, *corrupted and dissolved as it is, to its pristine frame, and when he hath done so, to reanimate its ancient soul to it, and animate it therewith.*

The former of these enquiries shall give beginning to my discourse; both because the most difficult to resolve, and because it contains several other queries in it; As,

1. Whether it be possible to God to remake a humane body of that dust into which it is at length resolv'd.

2. Whether he can find out that dust of ours, supposing it to be dispersed.

3. Whether he can rally together those dusts of humane bodies, how far soever dispers'd, and unite them both to one another, and their pristine bodies.

I. Now that it is possible to God to remake a humane body of that dust into which it is at length resolv'd (which is the first of the things propos'd to be enquir'd into) we have undoubted experiments in the works of God, and Nature, and Art, to establish us in the belief of. We read in the beginning of *Genesis* <sup>1</sup> that God *formed man of the dust of the ground* and made him become a living soul, as in like manner afterwards <sup>2</sup>, that as he was made of dust, so he should return again unto it. Now being man was at first made of dust, and shall be resolv'd into it again, what should hinder God from remaking his body of it, any more than the so making of it at first. If it be dust after its decease, it is no more than it originally was; and therefore, if God's power be the same, as possible to be remade of it, as it was to be form'd out of it at first. From this work of God pass we to one of nature, or rather which God exerciseth by her Ministry and Function; and consider we as well what every individual man is now made up of, as what the progenitor of them all was: Not indeed of dust, but of a thing which in all appearance is as unlikely to produce us, and in which we cannot discern the rudiments of those various parts into which we do afterwards grow, and this too, to make our conception look more like a resurrection, fram'd and fashioned in the lower parts of the earth. Now if it be not impossible for a humane body to be fram'd out of such a matter what is as similar as the dust of the earth, and therefore as unlikely to produce so great a variety of parts as every humane body consists of, which impossibility can there be, especially when God is the Architect, to frame it out of its pristine dust? And indeed (as *Justin Martyr* well discourses) as a resurrection appears harsh to us, because never any examples of it hapned within our knowledge; so there is no doubt the manner of the generation of a humane body would appear as harsh, if it were in like manner concealed from us, and we should be as hard to believe the framing of nerves and bones and flesh out of that out of which they are fram'd, as we now are, that they shall sometime be so out of the dust of the earth. Now (as the same *Father* goes on) as we should not have conceiv'd a humane body could result from such materials, and yet we see it actually done; in like manner ought we to think that it is not impossible for the bodies of men, being dissolv'd and cast like seed into the earth, at the command of God to rise again in their proper season, and put on not only their pristine shape, but immortality and glory. Thus, if we would not over-look those things that are evident to our senses,

<sup>1</sup> Gen. 2. 7.

<sup>2</sup> — 3. 19.

<sup>1</sup> Apol. 2. pag. 65.

senses, we might meet with a sufficient proof of a resurrection even in them, and every conception of the womb both prove and illustrate the possibility of a resurrection from the grave. And though I cannot think there is the like force in that which *St. Paul* seems to argue from, where speaking concerning that *grane* which is cast into the earth he affirmeth, *Thou fool<sup>e</sup>, that which thou sowest is not quickned, except it die*; because that *grane* in strict and proper speaking is rather brooded upon and matur'd, than mortified by the womb of the earth: Yet, as I cannot but have so much respect for *St. Paul* as to believe he would not have urg'd it, unless there were some force in it to evince the possibility of a resurrection, so thus much must be granted to that *grane* which he makes use of to facilitate the belief of the other, that it approacheth so near to a mortification as to have the *compages* thereof altered and dissolved by the earth, and may therefore pass for a partial proof and umbrage of that resurrection, which he propos'd to establish and illustrate by the re flourishing thereof. Lastly as *God* and *Nature* afford us proofs of a resurrection, so *Art*, which is but an imitation of both, doth; it being in the power of *Chymistry*, as the masters of that art inform us, to raise a plant out of its own ashes. And then who can deem it impossible for God out of our dust and ashes to reproduce that body, which was ere while resolv'd into it?

f 1 Cor. 15. 36.

2. The second question follows, even whether, as God can remake our bodies out of that dust into which they are resolv'd, so he can find out that dust of ours, supposing it to be *dispers'd*. A question no way difficult for those to resolve, who consider the *immenseness of the divine knowledge*, the *opinions even of the heathen concerning it*, or the *doctrine of the Scripture*. It is a memorable speech, that which *Apollo* delivered concerning himself by his Priests, and which therefore we may well imagine the heathen squar'd their opinions by,

Οἶδ' αὖ τίς ἴσῃ τ' ἀκούει τ' ἀνέμῳ καὶ μύθῳ θάλασσης,  
καὶ κρητὶς κυλινδρῶ, καὶ ὃ πανόρτοις ἀνέω.

*I know* (saith he) *the number of the sands, and the measures of the sea, I understand the dumb, and hear him who cannot speak*. Than which what better account can be given of the Divine Nature by any Spirit that is not also divine? Now if what *Apollo* affirmed of himself may with truth be appli'd to him who is the *God* even of that *Apollo*, and he do really *understand the number of the sands, and every drop of the sea*, which are not to be done but by the presence of each to his understanding; What doubt can remain of his descrying every member of us, into how little particles soever crumbled, and how far soever dispersed from each other? The *sand of the sea* being, both in the Scripture, and common speech, a popular description of that which is *numberless*, and consequently including the greatest numbers in it. Whether therefore the Scripture (which is no doubt the most infallible *Oracle* of the two, and from which we may promise our selves the most Authentick account of the Divine Nature) predicate the like things concerning it, must be our next enquiry; though we shall not need to go far for our information in it. For though I will not undertake to produce the same expressions concerning God (as what need is there of such an agreement, where the sense is perfectly the same?) yet will it not be difficult to shew, that

that it hath those which are as clear and full, and which tend alike to persuade that God hath a minute and particular knowledge of all things whatsoever, and therefore also of our own dusts. For who can think the number or distance of those dusts from each other can render them indiscernible to the divine understanding, when we understand by the Psalmist: that God *telleth the number of the stars, and calleth them all by their names?* And much more, when we find God insinuating concerning himself, that he *measures the waters in the hollow of his hand, and metes out the heaven with a span, and comprehends the dust of the earth in a measure*, or (as some have not improbably render'd it) within his three fingers, *and weighs the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance*. For here we have a knowledge which extends to the dust of the earth as well as to that of humane bodies, yea in comparison of which the others number and distance is so very inconsiderable that one three fingers of it alone will extend themselves over the whole. To all which if we add the *immenseness*, of the divine knowledge, and which we find reason<sup>2</sup> as well as Scripture<sup>3</sup> to bear witness to, so it will easily appear, that God can find out the dust of humane bodies, how far soever separated from each other.

<sup>1</sup> Psa. 147. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Isa. 40. 12.

<sup>2</sup> Expl. of those words I believe in God.

<sup>3</sup> Psa. 147. 5.

3. The only thing therefore to be farther inquir'd into upon this head, is whether, as God can find out the dusts of humane bodies how far soever dispers'd, so he can rally them together, and unite them to their proper ones. Of which as the great power of God will not suffer us to doubt, and the ignorance whereof (as our Saviour assures<sup>2</sup> us) is in a great measure the cause of mens infidelity in this affair; so there is nothing to impede it, but that by the *transmutation of things below* some particles of matter may happen in different times to be the portions of different men, and so impossible to be afterwards united to them both. For thus men are sometimes devour'd by fishes, and those fishes it may be afterwards devour'd by men. But as many of those things, which we devour, are not at all proper for our nourishment (and why may we not conceive so of humane flesh, because, to be sure, never ordain'd for the nourishment of us?) As the far greater part, even of that which is, goes away by excretions, whether they be those more known and sensible ones, or that more secret but withall more large one of *perspiration*; As in fine, if any part of one humane body should in tract of time come to be a part of another's, yet it may wear off again, and so be in a condition to be restor'd to him who did deposite it; So it is not therefore difficult to conceive, that though humane flesh should be allowed to be a proper matter for our nourishment, especially as it may come to be altered or corrected, yet God, who watcheth over all things by his providence, and governs them by his power, may so order the matter, that it either come not at all to be a part of another's body, or wear off again before his decease: By which means, the party, to whom it did at first appertain, may without any prejudice from hence be restored to that body which he deposited, and which no doubt is *that* which the resurrection doth principally intend, because a resurrection from the dead. Only if it should be said, that the doctrine of Christianity, and the general reason of the resurrection, may seem to persuade as well the *identity* of the body rising with that in which we all along convers'd on earth, as well as with that which we did deposite, wherewith the change we but now intimated to happen to humane bodies may seem but ill to agree;

<sup>2</sup> Mat. 22. 29.



gree; Though I shall not go about to deny the *allegation*, because having said somewhat before to establish it, and being by and by to give farther strength to it, yet I shall not stick to say, that the evidence we have from Christianity, and so from God, of the rising of that very body in which we either offended or pleased God whilst we conversed here, is proof enough to reasonable men that *that* God, who hath promis'd the resurrection of it, will take care that it shall not come to be so changed whilst it converseth here, but that it shall preserve enough of it self to salve his own promise, and to make it appear to be one and the same body which partook with the Soul in its either piety or impiety, and which shall partake with it in its reward or punishment: The evidence of Faith, however it may yield to the clear dictates of reason or the certain testimonies of our senses, yet being in reason to prevail above all probable deductions from them, which is as much as any sober man will pretend to about the manner or measure of the transmutation of humane bodies. For though *Theſeus* his ship might be patch'd and piec'd so long, till it came at length not to have *one old piece* remaining in it; Yet as I see no necessity to grant, nor will any man be ever able to prove, that there is such a transmutation in humane bodies, especially after they arrive at maturity, and when they come to be in a capacity to partake with the Soul in good and evil; so it seems to me no great denial of our reason to believe, that God both can and will preserve them so much in one estate, as to make them continue the same bodies whilst they remain here, and so be in a condition to become the same bodies again, when God shall raise them from their graves. Thus far therefore nothing appears why we should not look upon the resurrection of the body as possible, and consequently nothing to be accounted for but the *possibility* of Gods *reuniting to the body* thus remade *its ancient soul*, and making it *again to live and breath*.

<sup>a</sup> Gen. 2. 7.

<sup>b</sup> 1 Cor. 15. 13.

But as much of this difficulty will be taken off by considering, that, after God had *formed the first man of the dust of the earth*<sup>a</sup>, he *breathed into his nostrils the breath of life*, and so man became a *living soul* (for why should it not be as easie to restore life and breath to our re-erected bodies, as it was to give life and breath to that of *Adam*?) So that difficulty will be wholly superseded by the evidence we have of the reenlivening of *Christ's* crucified body, and of those others whom we are assured that *Christ* raised from death to life. For as it is a good argument which *St. Paul* urgeth in his Epistle to the *Corinthians*<sup>b</sup>, that *if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is not Christ risen*, so is it alike on the other side, that if *Christ's* dead body were reanimated and reenlivened, it is not at all incongruous to think that other dead bodies, when brought back to the same estate wherein *Christ's* was just before his resurrection, should in like manner be reanimated and reenlivened; That which *hath been* being possible *to be again*, where all things are in like manner dispos'd.

III. Having thus given an account of the *nature* of the *resurrection* here asserted, and, which is more, if I mistake not, no unsatisfactory account of the *possibility* thereof; enquire we in the *third* place what evidence there is of its *futurity* from the dictates either of Scripture or reason. For though this *latter* will not furnish us with any thing of certainty, or at least which we, by reason of the weakness of our conceptions, can with any certainty build upon; yet will it furnish us with such

such proofs as are at least greatly probable, and which therefore will serve so much the more to facilitate our belief of, or establish us in the doctrine of the Scripture. For since man is confessedly made up of Soul and Body; since however that Soul may sometime act abstractedly, yet for the most part it acts in concurrence with, and by the mediation of that body to which it is join'd; It will be but reasonable to believe, that as both have shar'd in the actions, so both shall hereafter share in the reward of them, because it is certain enough, that neither the one nor the other doth so with any certainty or fulness here. To bring this therefore about, that body, whereof we speak, must be brought back to its pristine estate, as well as the Soul continued in its. The only thing that hath hindred the allowance of this inference, is a perswasion that hath prevailed, that the body is no other to the Soul, than any *other instrument* wherewith either that, or the whole person acts. But as that is a thing which agrees not with the inward sense of mankind, and which, it may be in things of this nature, is a more forcible proof, than all the reasonings of *Philosophical* minds, so it takes away the distinction between *living* and *dead* instruments, and (which I doubt men will continue to embrace, whether they will or no) the belief of the bodies receiving from the Soul *life* and *sense*, and not being barely *actuated* or rather *agitated* by it. For though *life* and *sense* belong not to a body as *such*, yet I see not why it may not belong to it when it comes to be *informed* by a more active principle, and that body therefore become a sharer with the Soul in its pleasures or burdens, and consequently also in its future rewards or punishments. Sure I am, because taught so by the *Scripture*, that the design of Christs raising men out of their graves is the *retributing* to them <sup>c</sup> according to what they have done in <sup>d</sup> those bodies which they there deposited. But <sup>e</sup> what congruity a resurrection hath with that, supposing the body to have no other relation to the Soul than any other instrument, is I think hard to be defin'd, and we might as well appear before the judgment seat without any body, as without that which we deposited. <sup>f</sup> <sup>g</sup> <sup>h</sup> <sup>i</sup> <sup>j</sup> <sup>k</sup> <sup>l</sup> <sup>m</sup> <sup>n</sup> <sup>o</sup> <sup>p</sup> <sup>q</sup> <sup>r</sup> <sup>s</sup> <sup>t</sup> <sup>u</sup> <sup>v</sup> <sup>w</sup> <sup>x</sup> <sup>y</sup> <sup>z</sup> <sup>aa</sup> <sup>ab</sup> <sup>ac</sup> <sup>ad</sup> <sup>ae</sup> <sup>af</sup> <sup>ag</sup> <sup>ah</sup> <sup>ai</sup> <sup>aj</sup> <sup>ak</sup> <sup>al</sup> <sup>am</sup> <sup>an</sup> <sup>ao</sup> <sup>ap</sup> <sup>aq</sup> <sup>ar</sup> <sup>as</sup> <sup>at</sup> <sup>au</sup> <sup>av</sup> <sup>aw</sup> <sup>ax</sup> <sup>ay</sup> <sup>az</sup> <sup>ba</sup> <sup>bb</sup> <sup>bc</sup> <sup>bd</sup> <sup>be</sup> <sup>bf</sup> <sup>bg</sup> <sup>bh</sup> <sup>bi</sup> <sup>bj</sup> <sup>bk</sup> <sup>bl</sup> <sup>bm</sup> <sup>bn</sup> <sup>bo</sup> <sup>bp</sup> <sup>bq</sup> <sup>br</sup> <sup>bs</sup> <sup>bt</sup> <sup>bu</sup> <sup>bv</sup> <sup>bw</sup> <sup>bx</sup> <sup>by</sup> <sup>bz</sup> <sup>ca</sup> <sup>cb</sup> <sup>cc</sup> <sup>cd</sup> <sup>ce</sup> <sup>cf</sup> <sup>cg</sup> <sup>ch</sup> <sup>ci</sup> <sup>cj</sup> <sup>ck</sup> <sup>cl</sup> <sup>cm</sup> <sup>cn</sup> <sup>co</sup> <sup>cp</sup> <sup>cq</sup> <sup>cr</sup> <sup>cs</sup> <sup>ct</sup> <sup>cu</sup> <sup>cv</sup> <sup>cw</sup> <sup>cx</sup> <sup>cy</sup> <sup>cz</sup> <sup>da</sup> <sup>db</sup> <sup>dc</sup> <sup>dd</sup> <sup>de</sup> <sup>df</sup> <sup>dg</sup> <sup>dh</sup> <sup>di</sup> <sup>dj</sup> <sup>dk</sup> <sup>dl</sup> <sup>dm</sup> <sup>dn</sup> <sup>do</sup> <sup>dp</sup> <sup>dq</sup> <sup>dr</sup> <sup>ds</sup> <sup>dt</sup> <sup>du</sup> <sup>dv</sup> <sup>dw</sup> <sup>dx</sup> <sup>dy</sup> <sup>dz</sup> <sup>ea</sup> <sup>eb</sup> <sup>ec</sup> <sup>ed</sup> <sup>ee</sup> <sup>ef</sup> <sup>eg</sup> <sup>eh</sup> <sup>ei</sup> <sup>ej</sup> <sup>ek</sup> <sup>el</sup> <sup>em</sup> <sup>en</sup> <sup>eo</sup> <sup>ep</sup> <sup>eq</sup> <sup>er</sup> <sup>es</sup> <sup>et</sup> <sup>eu</sup> <sup>ev</sup> <sup>ew</sup> <sup>ex</sup> <sup>ey</sup> <sup>ez</sup> <sup>fa</sup> <sup>fb</sup> <sup>fc</sup> <sup>fd</sup> <sup>fe</sup> <sup>ff</sup> <sup>fg</sup> <sup>fh</sup> <sup>fi</sup> <sup>fj</sup> <sup>fk</sup> <sup>fl</sup> <sup>fm</sup> <sup>fn</sup> <sup>fo</sup> <sup>fp</sup> <sup>fq</sup> <sup>fr</sup> <sup>fs</sup> <sup>ft</sup> <sup>fu</sup> <sup>fv</sup> <sup>fw</sup> <sup>fx</sup> <sup>fy</sup> <sup>fz</sup> <sup>ga</sup> <sup>gb</sup> <sup>gc</sup> <sup>gd</sup> <sup>ge</sup> <sup>gf</sup> <sup>gg</sup> <sup>gh</sup> <sup>gi</sup> <sup>gj</sup> <sup>gk</sup> <sup>gl</sup> <sup>gm</sup> <sup>gn</sup> <sup>go</sup> <sup>gp</sup> <sup>gq</sup> <sup>gr</sup> <sup>gs</sup> <sup>gt</sup> <sup>gu</sup> <sup>gv</sup> <sup>gw</sup> <sup>gx</sup> <sup>gy</sup> <sup>gz</sup> <sup>ha</sup> <sup>hb</sup> <sup>hc</sup> <sup>hd</sup> <sup>he</sup> <sup>hf</sup> <sup>hg</sup> <sup>hh</sup> <sup>hi</sup> <sup>hj</sup> <sup>hk</sup> <sup>hl</sup> <sup>hm</sup> <sup>hn</sup> <sup>ho</sup> <sup>hp</sup> <sup>hq</sup> <sup>hr</sup> <sup>hs</sup> <sup>ht</sup> <sup>hu</sup> <sup>hv</sup> <sup>hw</sup> <sup>hx</sup> <sup>hy</sup> <sup>hz</sup> <sup>ia</sup> <sup>ib</sup> <sup>ic</sup> <sup>id</sup> <sup>ie</sup> <sup>if</sup> <sup>ig</sup> <sup>ih</sup> <sup>ii</sup> <sup>ij</sup> <sup>ik</sup> <sup>il</sup> <sup>im</sup> <sup>in</sup> <sup>io</sup> <sup>ip</sup> <sup>iq</sup> <sup>ir</sup> <sup>is</sup> <sup>it</sup> <sup>iu</sup> <sup>iv</sup> <sup>iw</sup> <sup>ix</sup> <sup>iy</sup> <sup>iz</sup> <sup>ja</sup> <sup>jb</sup> <sup>jc</sup> <sup>jd</sup> <sup>je</sup> <sup>jf</sup> <sup>jj</sup> <sup>jk</sup> <sup>jl</sup> <sup>jm</sup> <sup>jn</sup> <sup>jo</sup> <sup>jp</sup> <sup>jq</sup> <sup>jr</sup> <sup>js</sup> <sup>jt</sup> <sup>ju</sup> <sup>jv</sup> <sup>jw</sup> <sup>jx</sup> <sup>ky</sup> <sup>kz</sup> <sup>la</sup> <sup>lb</sup> <sup>lc</sup> <sup>ld</sup> <sup>le</sup> <sup>lf</sup> <sup>lg</sup> <sup>lh</sup> <sup>li</sup> <sup>lj</sup> <sup>lk</sup> <sup>ll</sup> <sup>lm</sup> <sup>ln</sup> <sup>lo</sup> <sup>lp</sup> <sup>lq</sup> <sup>lr</sup> <sup>ls</sup> <sup>lt</sup> <sup>lu</sup> <sup>lv</sup> <sup>lw</sup> <sup>lx</sup> <sup>ly</sup> <sup>lz</sup> <sup>ma</sup> <sup>mb</sup> <sup>mc</sup> <sup>md</sup> <sup>me</sup> <sup>mf</sup> <sup>mg</sup> <sup>mh</sup> <sup>mi</sup> <sup>mj</sup> <sup>mk</sup> <sup>ml</sup> <sup>mm</sup> <sup>mn</sup> <sup>mo</sup> <sup>mp</sup> <sup>mq</sup> <sup>mr</sup> <sup>ms</sup> <sup>mt</sup> <sup>mu</sup> <sup>mv</sup> <sup>mw</sup> <sup>mx</sup> <sup>my</sup> <sup>mz</sup> <sup>na</sup> <sup>nb</sup> <sup>nc</sup> <sup>nd</sup> <sup>ne</sup> <sup>nf</sup> <sup>ng</sup> <sup>nh</sup> <sup>ni</sup> <sup>nj</sup> <sup>nk</sup> <sup>nl</sup> <sup>nm</sup> <sup>nn</sup> <sup>no</sup> <sup>np</sup> <sup>nq</sup> <sup>nr</sup> <sup>ns</sup> <sup>nt</sup> <sup>nu</sup> <sup>nv</sup> <sup>nw</sup> <sup>nx</sup> <sup>ny</sup> <sup>nz</sup> <sup>oa</sup> <sup>ob</sup> <sup>oc</sup> <sup>od</sup> <sup>oe</sup> <sup>of</sup> <sup>og</sup> <sup>oh</sup> <sup>oi</sup> <sup>oj</sup> <sup>ok</sup> <sup>ol</sup> <sup>om</sup> <sup>on</sup> <sup>oo</sup> <sup>op</sup> <sup>oq</sup> <sup>or</sup> <sup>os</sup> <sup>ot</sup> <sup>ou</sup> <sup>ov</sup> <sup>ow</sup> <sup>ox</sup> <sup>oy</sup> <sup>oz</sup> <sup>pa</sup> <sup>pb</sup> <sup>pc</sup> <sup>pd</sup> <sup>pe</sup> <sup>pf</sup> <sup>pg</sup> <sup>ph</sup> <sup>pi</sup> <sup>pj</sup> <sup>pk</sup> <sup>pl</sup> <sup>pm</sup> <sup>pn</sup> <sup>po</sup> <sup>pp</sup> <sup>pq</sup> <sup>pr</sup> <sup>ps</sup> <sup>pt</sup> <sup>pu</sup> <sup>pv</sup> <sup>pw</sup> <sup>px</sup> <sup>py</sup> <sup>pz</sup> <sup>qa</sup> <sup>qb</sup> <sup>qc</sup> <sup>qd</sup> <sup>qe</sup> <sup>qf</sup> <sup>qg</sup> <sup>qh</sup> <sup>qi</sup> <sup>qj</sup> <sup>qk</sup> <sup>ql</sup> <sup>qm</sup> <sup>qn</sup> <sup>qo</sup> <sup>qp</sup> <sup>qq</sup> <sup>qr</sup> <sup>qs</sup> <sup>qt</sup> <sup>qu</sup> <sup>qv</sup> <sup>qw</sup> <sup>qx</sup> <sup>qy</sup> <sup>qz</sup> <sup>ra</sup> <sup>rb</sup> <sup>rc</sup> <sup>rd</sup> <sup>re</sup> <sup>rf</sup> <sup>rg</sup> <sup>rh</sup> <sup>ri</sup> <sup>rj</sup> <sup>rk</sup> <sup>rl</sup> <sup>rm</sup> <sup>rn</sup> <sup>ro</sup> <sup>rp</sup> <sup>rq</sup> <sup>rr</sup> <sup>rs</sup> <sup>rt</sup> <sup>ru</sup> <sup>rv</sup> <sup>rw</sup> <sup>rx</sup> <sup>ry</sup> <sup>rz</sup> <sup>sa</sup> <sup>sb</sup> <sup>sc</sup> <sup>sd</sup> <sup>se</sup> <sup>sf</sup> <sup>sg</sup> <sup>sh</sup> <sup>si</sup> <sup>sj</sup> <sup>sk</sup> <sup>sl</sup> <sup>sm</sup> <sup>sn</sup> <sup>so</sup> <sup>sp</sup> <sup>sq</sup> <sup>sr</sup> <sup>ss</sup> <sup>st</sup> <sup>su</sup> <sup>sv</sup> <sup>sw</sup> <sup>sx</sup> <sup>sy</sup> <sup>sz</sup> <sup>ta</sup> <sup>tb</sup> <sup>tc</sup> <sup>td</sup> <sup>te</sup> <sup>tf</sup> <sup>tg</sup> <sup>th</sup> <sup>ti</sup> <sup>tj</sup> <sup>tk</sup> <sup>tl</sup> <sup>tm</sup> <sup>tn</sup> <sup>to</sup> <sup>tp</sup>  <sup>tq</sup> <sup>tr</sup> <sup>ts</sup> <sup>tt</sup> <sup>tu</sup> <sup>tv</sup> <sup>tw</sup> <sup>tx</sup> <sup>ty</sup> <sup>tz</sup> <sup>ua</sup> <sup>ub</sup> <sup>uc</sup> <sup>ud</sup> <sup>ue</sup> <sup>uf</sup> <sup>ug</sup> <sup>uh</sup> <sup>ui</sup> <sup>uj</sup> <sup>uk</sup> <sup>ul</sup> <sup>um</sup> <sup>un</sup> <sup>uo</sup> <sup>up</sup> <sup>uq</sup> <sup>ur</sup> <sup>us</sup> <sup>ut</sup> <sup>uu</sup> <sup>uv</sup> <sup>uw</sup> <sup>ux</sup> <sup>uy</sup> <sup>uz</sup> <sup>va</sup> <sup>vb</sup> <sup>vc</sup> <sup>vd</sup> <sup>ve</sup> <sup>vf</sup> <sup>vg</sup> <sup>vh</sup> <sup>vi</sup> <sup>vj</sup> <sup>vk</sup> <sup>vl</sup> <sup>vm</sup> <sup>vn</sup> <sup>vo</sup> <sup>vp</sup> <sup>vq</sup> <sup>vr</sup> <sup>vs</sup> <sup>vt</sup> <sup>vu</sup> <sup>vv</sup> <sup>vw</sup> <sup>vx</sup> <sup>vy</sup> <sup>vz</sup> <sup>wa</sup> <sup>wb</sup> <sup>wc</sup> <sup>wd</sup> <sup>we</sup> <sup>wf</sup> <sup>wg</sup> <sup>wh</sup> <sup>wi</sup> <sup>wj</sup> <sup>wk</sup> <sup>wl</sup> <sup>wm</sup> <sup>wn</sup> <sup>wo</sup> <sup>wp</sup> <sup>wq</sup> <sup>wr</sup> <sup>ws</sup> <sup>wt</sup> <sup>wu</sup> <sup>wv</sup> <sup>ww</sup> <sup>wx</sup> <sup>wy</sup> <sup>wz</sup> <sup>xa</sup> <sup>xb</sup> <sup>xc</sup> <sup>xd</sup> <sup>xe</sup> <sup>xf</sup> <sup>xg</sup> <sup>xh</sup> <sup>xi</sup> <sup>xj</sup> <sup>xk</sup> <sup>xl</sup> <sup>xm</sup> <sup>xn</sup> <sup>xo</sup> <sup>xp</sup> <sup>xq</sup> <sup>xr</sup> <sup>xs</sup> <sup>xt</sup> <sup>xu</sup> <sup>xv</sup> <sup>xw</sup> <sup>xx</sup> <sup>xy</sup> <sup>xz</sup> <sup>ya</sup> <sup>yb</sup> <sup>yc</sup> <sup>yd</sup> <sup>ye</sup> <sup>yf</sup> <sup>yg</sup> <sup>yh</sup> <sup>yi</sup> <sup>yj</sup> <sup>yk</sup> <sup>yl</sup> <sup>ym</sup> <sup>yn</sup> <sup>yo</sup> <sup>yp</sup> <sup>yq</sup> <sup>yr</sup> <sup>ys</sup> <sup>yt</sup> <sup>yu</sup> <sup>yv</sup> <sup>yw</sup> <sup>yx</sup> <sup>yy</sup> <sup>yz</sup> <sup>za</sup> <sup>zb</sup> <sup>zc</sup> <sup>zd</sup> <sup>ze</sup> <sup>zf</sup> <sup>zg</sup> <sup>zh</sup> <sup>zi</sup> <sup>zj</sup> <sup>zk</sup> <sup>zl</sup> <sup>zm</sup> <sup>zn</sup> <sup>zo</sup> <sup>zp</sup> <sup>zq</sup> <sup>zr</sup> <sup>zs</sup> <sup>zt</sup> <sup>zu</sup> <sup>zv</sup> <sup>zw</sup> <sup>zx</sup> <sup>zy</sup> <sup>zz</sup> <sup>aa</sup> <sup>ab</sup> <sup>ac</sup> <sup>ad</sup> <sup>ae</sup> <sup>af</sup> <sup>ag</sup> <sup>ah</sup> <sup>ai</sup> <sup>aj</sup> <sup>ak</sup> <sup>al</sup> <sup>am</sup> <sup>an</sup> <sup>ao</sup> <sup>ap</sup> <sup>aq</sup> <sup>ar</sup> <sup>as</sup> <sup>at</sup> <sup>au</sup> <sup>av</sup> <sup>aw</sup> <sup>ax</sup> <sup>ay</sup> <sup>az</sup> <sup>ba</sup> <sup>bb</sup> <sup>bc</sup> <sup>bd</sup> <sup>be</sup> <sup>bf</sup> <sup>bg</sup> <sup>bh</sup> <sup>bi</sup> <sup>bj</sup> <sup>bk</sup> <sup>bl</sup> <sup>bm</sup> <sup>bn</sup> <sup>bo</sup> <sup>bp</sup> <sup>bq</sup> <sup>br</sup> <sup>bs</sup> <sup>bt</sup> <sup>bu</sup> <sup>bv</sup> <sup>bw</sup> <sup>bx</sup> <sup>by</sup> <sup>bz</sup> <sup>ca</sup> <sup>cb</sup> <sup>cc</sup> <sup>cd</sup> <sup>ce</sup> <sup>cf</sup> <sup>cg</sup> <sup>ch</sup> <sup>ci</sup> <sup>cj</sup> <sup>ck</sup> <sup>cl</sup> <sup>cm</sup> <sup>cn</sup> <sup>co</sup> <sup>cp</sup> <sup>cq</sup> <sup>cr</sup> <sup>cs</sup> <sup>ct</sup> <sup>cu</sup> <sup>cv</sup> <sup>cw</sup> <sup>cx</sup> <sup>cy</sup> <sup>cz</sup> <sup>da</sup> <sup>db</sup> <sup>dc</sup> <sup>dd</sup> <sup>de</sup> <sup>df</sup> <sup>dg</sup> <sup>dh</sup> <sup>di</sup> <sup>dj</sup> <sup>dk</sup> <sup>dl</sup> <sup>dm</sup> <sup>dn</sup> <sup>do</sup> <sup>dp</sup> <sup>dq</sup> <sup>dr</sup> <sup>ds</sup> <sup>dt</sup> <sup>du</sup> <sup>dv</sup> <sup>dw</sup> <sup>dx</sup> <sup>dy</sup> <sup>dz</sup> <sup>ea</sup> <sup>eb</sup> <sup>ec</sup> <sup>ed</sup> <sup>ee</sup> <sup>ef</sup> <sup>eg</sup> <sup>eh</sup> <sup>ei</sup> <sup>ej</sup> <sup>ek</sup> <sup>el</sup> <sup>em</sup> <sup>en</sup> <sup>eo</sup> <sup>ep</sup> <sup>eq</sup> <sup>er</sup> <sup>es</sup> <sup>et</sup> <sup>eu</sup> <sup>ev</sup> <sup>ew</sup> <sup>ex</sup> <sup>ey</sup> <sup>ez</sup> <sup>fa</sup> <sup>fb</sup> <sup>fc</sup> <sup>fd</sup> <sup>fe</sup> <sup>ff</sup> <sup>fg</sup> <sup>fh</sup> <sup>fi</sup> <sup>fj</sup> <sup>fk</sup> <sup>fl</sup> <sup>fm</sup> <sup>fn</sup> <sup>fo</sup> <sup>fp</sup> <sup>fq</sup> <sup>fr</sup> <sup>fs</sup> <sup>ft</sup> <sup>fu</sup> <sup>fv</sup> <sup>fw</sup> <sup>fx</sup> <sup>fy</sup> <sup>fz</sup> <sup>ga</sup> <sup>gb</sup> <sup>gc</sup> <sup>gd</sup> <sup>ge</sup> <sup>gf</sup> <sup>gg</sup> <sup>gh</sup> <sup>gi</sup> <sup>gj</sup> <sup>gk</sup> <sup>gl</sup> <sup>gm</sup> <sup>gn</sup> <sup>go</sup> <sup>gp</sup> <sup>gq</sup> <sup>gr</sup> <sup>gs</sup> <sup>gt</sup> <sup>gu</sup> <sup>gv</sup> <sup>gw</sup> <sup>gx</sup> <sup>gy</sup> <sup>gz</sup> <sup>ha</sup> <sup>hb</sup> <sup>hc</sup> <sup>hd</sup> <sup>he</sup> <sup>hf</sup> <sup>hg</sup> <sup>hh</sup> <sup>hi</sup> <sup>hj</sup> <sup>hk</sup> <sup>hl</sup> <sup>hm</sup> <sup>hn</sup> <sup>ho</sup> <sup>hp</sup> <sup>hq</sup> <sup>hr</sup> <sup>hs</sup> <sup>ht</sup> <sup>hu</sup> <sup>hv</sup> <sup>hw</sup> <sup>hx</sup> <sup>hy</sup> <sup>hz</sup> <sup>ia</sup> <sup>ib</sup> <sup>ic</sup> <sup>id</sup> <sup>ie</sup> <sup>if</sup> <sup>ig</sup> <sup>ih</sup> <sup>ii</sup> <sup>ij</sup> <sup>ik</sup> <sup>il</sup> <sup>im</sup> <sup>in</sup> <sup>io</sup> <sup>ip</sup> <sup>iq</sup> <sup>ir</sup> <sup>is</sup> <sup>it</sup> <sup>iu</sup> <sup>iv</sup> <sup>iw</sup> <sup>ix</sup> <sup>iy</sup> <sup>iz</sup> <sup>ja</sup> <sup>jb</sup> <sup>jc</sup> <sup>jd</sup> <sup>je</sup> <sup>jf</sup> <sup>jj</sup> <sup>jk</sup> <sup>jl</sup> <sup>jm</sup> <sup>jn</sup> <sup>jo</sup> <sup>jp</sup> <sup>jq</sup> <sup>jr</sup> <sup>js</sup> <sup>jt</sup> <sup>ju</sup> <sup>jv</sup> <sup>jw</sup> <sup>jx</sup> <sup>ky</sup> <sup>kz</sup> <sup>la</sup> <sup>lb</sup> <sup>lc</sup> <sup>ld</sup> <sup>le</sup> <sup>lf</sup> <sup>lg</sup> <sup>lh</sup> <sup>li</sup> <sup>lj</sup> <sup>lk</sup> <sup>ll</sup> <sup>lm</sup> <sup>ln</sup> <sup>lo</sup> <sup>lp</sup> <sup>lq</sup> <sup>lr</sup> <sup>ls</sup> <sup>lt</sup> <sup>lu</sup> <sup>lv</sup> <sup>lw</sup> <sup>lx</sup> <sup>ly</sup> <sup>lz</sup> <sup>ma</sup> <sup>mb</sup> <sup>mc</sup> <sup>md</sup> <sup>me</sup> <sup>mf</sup> <sup>mg</sup> <sup>mh</sup> <sup>mi</sup> <sup>mj</sup> <sup>mk</sup> <sup>ml</sup> <sup>mm</sup> <sup>mn</sup> <sup>mo</sup> <sup>mp</sup> <sup>mq</sup> <sup>mr</sup> <sup>ms</sup> <sup>mt</sup> <sup>mu</sup> <sup>mv</sup> <sup>mw</sup> <sup>mx</sup> <sup>my</sup> <sup>mz</sup> <sup>na</sup> <sup>nb</sup> <sup>nc</sup> <sup>nd</sup> <sup>ne</sup> <sup>nf</sup> <sup>ng</sup> <sup>nh</sup> <sup>ni</sup> <sup>nj</sup> <sup>nk</sup> <sup>nl</sup> <sup>nm</sup> <sup>nn</sup> <sup>no</sup> <sup>np</sup> <sup>nq</sup> <sup>nr</sup> <sup>ns</sup> <sup>nt</sup> <sup>nu</sup> <sup>nv</sup> <sup>nw</sup> <sup>nx</sup> <sup>ny</sup> <sup>nz</sup> <sup>oa</sup> <sup>ob</sup> <sup>oc</sup> <sup>od</sup> <sup>oe</sup> <sup>of</sup> <sup>og</sup> <sup>oh</sup> <sup>oi</sup> <sup>oj</sup> <sup>ok</sup> <sup>ol</sup> <sup>om</sup> <sup>on</sup> <sup>oo</sup> <sup>op</sup> <sup>oq</sup> <sup>or</sup> <sup>os</sup> <sup>ot</sup> <sup>ou</sup> <sup>ov</sup> <sup>ow</sup> <sup>ox</sup> <sup>oy</sup> <sup>oz</sup> <sup>pa</sup> <sup>pb</sup> <sup>pc</sup> <sup>pd</sup> <sup>pe</sup> <sup>pf</sup> <sup>pg</sup> <sup>ph</sup> <sup>pi</sup> <sup>pj</sup> <sup>pk</sup> <sup>pl</sup> <sup>pm</sup> <sup>pn</sup> <sup>po</sup> <sup>pp</sup> <sup>pq</sup> <sup>pr</sup> <sup>ps</sup> <sup>pt</sup> <sup>pu</sup> <sup>pv</sup> <sup>pw</sup> <sup>px</sup> <sup>py</sup> <sup>pz</sup> <sup>qa</sup> <sup>qb</sup> <sup>qc</sup> <sup>qd</sup> <sup>qe</sup> <sup>qf</sup> <sup>qg</sup> <sup>qh</sup> <sup>qi</sup> <sup>qj</sup> <sup>qk</sup> <sup>ql</sup> <sup>qm</sup> <sup>qn</sup> <sup>qo</sup> <sup>qp</sup> <sup>qq</sup> <sup>qr</sup> <sup>qs</sup> <sup>qt</sup> <sup>qu</sup> <sup>qv</sup> <sup>qw</sup> <sup>qx</sup> <sup>qy</sup> <sup>qz</sup> <sup>ra</sup> <sup>rb</sup> <sup>rc</sup> <sup>rd</sup> <sup>re</sup> <sup>rf</sup> <sup>rg</sup> <sup>rh</sup> <sup>ri</sup> <sup>rj</sup> <sup>rk</sup> <sup>rl</sup> <sup>rm</sup> <sup>rn</sup> <sup>ro</sup> <sup>rp</sup> <sup>rq</sup> <sup>rr</sup> <sup>rs</sup> <sup>rt</sup> <sup>ru</sup> <sup>rv</sup> <sup>rw</sup> <sup>rx</sup> <sup>ry</sup> <sup>rz</sup> <sup>sa</sup> <sup>sb</sup> <sup>sc</sup> <sup>sd</sup> <sup>se</sup> <sup>sf</sup> <sup>sg</sup> <sup>sh</sup> <sup>si</sup> <sup>sj</sup> <sup>sk</sup> <sup>sl</sup> <sup>sm</sup> <sup>sn</sup> <sup>so</sup> <sup>sp</sup> <sup>sq</sup> <sup>sr</sup> <sup>ss</sup> <sup>st</sup> <sup>su</sup> <sup>sv</sup> <sup>sw</sup> <sup>sx</sup> <sup>sy</sup> <sup>sz</sup> <sup>ta</sup> <sup>tb</sup> <sup>tc</sup> <sup>td</sup> <sup>te</sup> <sup>tf</sup> <sup>tg</sup> <sup>th</sup> <sup>ti</sup> <sup>tj</sup> <sup>tk</sup> <sup>tl</sup> <sup>tm</sup> <sup>tn</sup> <sup>to</sup> <sup>tp</sup>  <sup>tq</sup> <sup>tr</sup> <sup>ts</sup> <sup>tt</sup> <sup>tu</sup> <sup>tv</sup> <sup>tw</sup> <sup>tx</sup> <sup>ty</sup> <sup>tz</sup> <sup>ua</sup> <sup>ub</sup> <sup>uc</sup> <sup>ud</sup> <sup>ue</sup> <sup>uf</sup> <sup>ug</sup> <sup>uh</sup> <sup>ui</sup> <sup>uj</sup> <sup>uk</sup> <sup>ul</sup> <sup>um</sup> <sup>un</sup> <sup>uo</sup> <sup>up</sup> <sup>uq</sup> <sup>ur</sup> <sup>us</sup> <sup>ut</sup> <sup>uu</sup> <sup>uv</sup> <sup>uw</sup> <sup>ux</sup> <sup>uy</sup> <sup>uz</sup> <sup>va</sup> <sup>vb</sup> <sup>vc</sup> <sup>vd</sup> <sup>ve</sup> <sup>vf</sup> <sup>vg</sup> <sup>vh</sup> <sup>vi</sup> <sup>vj</sup> <sup>vk</sup> <sup>vl</sup> <sup>vm</sup> <sup>vn</sup> <sup>vo</sup> <sup>vp</sup> <sup>vq</sup> <sup>vr</sup> <sup>vs</sup> <sup>vt</sup> <sup>vu</sup> <sup>vv</sup> <sup>vw</sup> <sup>vx</sup> <sup>vy</sup> <sup>vz</sup> <sup>wa</sup> <sup>wb</sup> <sup>wc</sup> <sup>wd</sup> <sup>we</sup> <sup>wf</sup> <sup>wg</sup> <sup>wh</sup> <sup>wi</sup> <sup>wj</sup> <sup>wk</sup> <sup>wl</sup> <sup>wm</sup> <sup>wn</sup> <sup>wo</sup> <sup>wp</sup> <sup>wq</sup> <sup>wr</sup> <sup>ws</sup> <sup>wt</sup> <sup>wu</sup> <sup>wv</sup> <sup>ww</sup> <sup>wx</sup> <sup>wy</sup> <sup>wz</sup> <sup>xa</sup> <sup>xb</sup> <sup>xc</sup> <sup>xd</sup> <sup>xe</sup> <sup>xf</sup> <sup>xg</sup> <sup>xh</sup> <sup>xi</sup> <sup>xj</sup> <sup>xk</sup> <sup>xl</sup> <sup>xm</sup> <sup>xn</sup> <sup>xo</sup> <sup>xp</sup> <sup>xq</sup> <sup>xr</sup> <sup>xs</sup> <sup>xt</sup> <sup>xu</sup> <sup>xv</sup> <sup>xw</sup> <sup>xx</sup> <sup>xy</sup> <sup>xz</sup> <sup>ya</sup> <sup>yb</sup> <sup>yc</sup> <sup>yd</sup> <sup>ye</sup> <sup>yf</sup> <sup>yg</sup> <sup>yh</sup> <sup>yi</sup> <sup>yj</sup> <sup>yk</sup> <sup>yl</sup> <sup>ym</sup> <sup>yn</sup> <sup>yo</sup> <sup>yp</sup> <sup>yq</sup> <sup>yr</sup> <sup>ys</sup> <sup>yt</sup> <sup>yu</sup> <sup>yv</sup> <sup>yw</sup> <sup>yx</sup> <sup>yy</sup> <sup>yz</sup> <sup>za</sup> <sup>zb</sup> <sup>zc</sup> <sup>zd</sup> <sup>ze</sup> <sup>zf</sup> <sup>zg</sup> <sup>zh</sup> <sup>zi</sup> <sup>zj</sup> <sup>zk</sup> <sup>zl</sup> <sup>zm</sup> <sup>zn</sup> <sup>zo</sup> <sup>zp</sup> <sup>zq</sup> <sup>zr</sup> <sup>zs</sup> <sup>zt</sup> <sup>zu</sup> <sup>zv</sup> <sup>zw</sup> <sup>zx</sup> <sup>zy</sup> <sup>zz</sup> <sup>aa</sup> <sup>ab</sup> <sup>ac</sup> <sup>ad</sup> <sup>ae</sup> <sup>af</sup> <sup>ag</sup> <sup>ah</sup> <sup>ai</sup> <sup>aj</sup> <sup>ak</sup> <sup>al</sup> <sup>am</sup> <sup>an</sup> <sup>ao</sup> <sup>ap</sup> <sup>aq</sup> <sup>ar</sup> <sup>as</sup> <sup>at</sup> <sup>au</sup> <sup>av</sup> <sup>aw</sup> <sup>ax</sup> <sup>ay</sup> <sup>az</sup> <sup>ba</sup> <sup>bb</sup> <sup>bc</sup> <sup>bd</sup> <sup>be</sup> <sup>bf</sup> <sup>bg</sup> <sup>bh</sup> <sup>bi</sup> <sup>bj</sup> <sup>bk</sup> <sup>bl</sup> <sup>bm</sup> <sup>bn</sup> <sup>bo</sup> <sup>bp</sup> <sup>bq</sup> <sup>br</sup> <sup>bs</sup> <sup>bt</sup> <sup>bu</sup> <sup>bv</sup> <sup>bw</sup> <sup>bx</sup> <sup>by</sup> <sup>bz</sup> <sup>ca</sup> <sup>cb</sup> <sup>cc</sup> <sup>cd</sup> <sup>ce</sup> <sup>cf</sup> <sup>cg</sup> <sup>ch</sup> <sup>ci</sup> <sup>cj</sup> <sup>ck</sup> <sup>cl</sup> <sup>cm</sup> <sup>cn</sup> <sup>co</sup> <sup>cp</sup> <sup>cq</sup> <sup>cr</sup> <sup>cs</sup> <sup>ct</sup> <sup>cu</sup> <sup>cv</sup> <sup>cw</sup> <sup>cx</sup> <sup>cy</sup> <sup>cz</sup> <sup>da</sup> <sup>db</sup> <sup>dc</sup> <sup>dd</sup> <sup>de</sup> <sup>df</sup> <sup>dg</sup> <sup>dh</sup> <sup>di</sup> <sup>dj</sup> <sup>dk</sup> <sup>dl</sup> <sup>dm</sup> <sup>dn</sup> <sup>do</sup> <sup>dp</sup> <sup>dq</sup> <sup>dr</sup> <sup>ds</sup> <sup>dt</sup> <sup>du</sup> <sup>dv</sup> <sup>dw</sup> <sup>dx</sup> <sup>dy</sup> <sup>dz</sup> <sup>ea</sup> <sup>eb</sup> <sup>ec</sup> <sup>ed</sup> <sup>ee</sup> <sup>ef</sup> <sup>eg</sup> <sup>eh</sup> <sup>ei</sup> <sup>ej</sup> <sup>ek</sup> <sup>el</sup> <sup>em</sup> <sup>en</sup> <sup>eo</sup> <sup>ep</sup> <sup>eq</sup> <sup>er</sup> <sup>es</sup> <sup>et</sup> <sup>eu</sup> <sup>ev</sup> <sup>ew</sup> <sup>ex</sup> <sup>ey</sup> <sup>ez</sup> <sup>fa</sup> <sup>fb</sup> <sup>fc</sup> <sup>fd</sup> <sup>fe</sup> <sup>ff</sup> <sup>fg</sup> <sup>fh</sup> <sup>fi</sup> <sup>fj</sup> <sup>fk</sup> <sup>fl</sup> <sup>fm</sup> <sup>fn</sup> <sup>fo</sup> <sup>fp</sup> <sup>fq</sup> <sup>fr</sup> <sup>fs</sup> <sup>ft</sup> <sup>fu</sup> <sup>fv</sup> <sup>fw</sup> <sup>fx</sup> <sup>fy</sup> <sup>fz</sup> <sup>ga</sup> <sup>gb</sup> <sup>gc</sup> <sup>gd</sup> <sup>ge</sup> <sup>gf</sup> <sup>gg</sup> <sup>gh</sup> <sup>gi</sup> <sup>gj</sup> <sup>gk</sup> <sup>gl</sup> <sup>gm</sup> <sup>gn</sup> <sup>go</sup> <sup>gp</sup> <sup>gq</sup> <sup>gr</sup> <sup>gs</sup> <sup>gt</sup> <sup>gu</sup> <sup>gv</sup> <sup>gw</sup> <sup>gx</sup> <sup>gy</sup> <sup>gz</sup> <sup>ha</sup> <sup>hb</sup> <sup>hc</sup> <sup>hd</sup> <sup>he</sup> <sup>hf</sup> <sup>hg</sup> <sup>hh</sup> <sup>hi</sup> <sup>hj</sup> <sup>hk</sup> <sup>hl</sup> <sup>hm</sup> <sup>hn</sup> <sup>ho</sup> <sup>hp</sup> <sup>hq</sup> <sup>hr</sup> <sup>hs</sup> <sup>ht</sup> <sup>hu</sup> <sup>hv</sup> <sup>hw</sup> <sup>hx</sup> <sup>hy</sup> <sup>hz</sup> <sup>ia</sup> <sup>ib</sup> <sup>ic</sup> <sup>id</sup> <sup>ie</sup> <sup>if</sup> <sup>ig</sup> <sup>ih</sup> <sup>ii</sup> <sup>ij</sup> <sup>ik</sup> <sup>il</sup> <sup>im</sup> <sup>in</sup> <sup>io</sup> <sup>ip</sup> <sup>iq</sup> <sup>ir</sup> <sup>is</sup> <sup>it</sup> <sup>iu</sup> <sup>iv</sup> <sup>iw</sup> <sup>ix</sup> <sup>iy</sup> <sup>iz</sup> <sup>ja</sup> <sup>jb</sup> <sup>jc</sup> <sup>jd</sup> <sup>je</sup> <sup>jf</sup> <sup>jj</sup> <sup>jk</sup> <sup>jl</sup> <sup>jm</sup> <sup>jn</sup> <sup>jo</sup> <sup>jp</sup> <sup>jq</sup> <sup>jr</sup> <sup>js</sup> <sup>jt</sup> <sup>ju</sup> <sup>jv</sup> <sup>jw</sup> <sup>jx</sup> <sup>ky</sup> <sup>kz</sup> <sup>la</sup> <sup>lb</sup> <sup>lc</sup> <sup>ld</sup> <sup>le</sup> <sup>lf</sup> <sup>lg</sup> <sup>lh</sup> <sup>li</sup> <sup>lj</sup> <sup>lk</sup> <sup>ll</sup> <sup>lm</sup> <sup>ln</sup> <sup>lo</sup> <sup>lp</sup> <sup>lq</sup> <sup>lr</sup> <sup>ls</sup> <sup>lt</sup> <sup>lu</sup> <sup>lv</sup> <sup>lw</sup> <sup>lx</sup> <sup>ly</sup> <sup>lz</sup> <sup>ma</sup> <sup>mb</sup> <sup>mc</sup> <sup>md</sup> <sup>me</sup> <sup>mf</sup> <sup>mg</sup> <sup>mh</sup> <sup>mi</sup> <sup>mj</sup> <sup>mk</sup> <sup>ml</sup> <sup>mm</sup> <sup>mn</sup> <sup>mo</sup> <sup>mp</sup> <sup>mq</sup> <sup>mr</sup> <sup>ms</sup> <sup>mt</sup> <sup>mu</sup> <sup>mv</sup> <sup>mw</sup> <sup>mx</sup> <sup>my</sup> <sup>mz</sup> <sup>na</sup> <sup>nb</sup> <sup>nc</sup> <sup>nd</sup> <sup>ne</sup> <sup>nf</sup> <sup>ng</sup> <sup>nh</sup> <sup>ni</sup> <sup>nj</sup> <sup>nk</sup> <sup>nl</sup> <sup>nm</sup> <sup>nn</sup> <sup>no</sup> <sup>np</sup> <sup>nq</sup> <sup>nr</sup> <sup>ns</sup> <sup>nt</sup> <sup>nu</sup> <sup>nv</sup> <sup>nw</sup> <sup>nx</sup> <sup>ny</sup> <sup>nz</sup> <sup>oa</sup> <sup>ob</sup> <sup>oc</sup> <sup>od</sup> <sup>oe</sup> <sup>of</sup> <sup>og</sup> <sup>oh</sup> <sup>oi</sup> <sup>oj</sup> <sup>ok</sup> <sup>ol</sup> <sup>om</sup> <sup>on</sup> <sup>oo</sup> <sup>op</sup> <sup>oq</sup>

glosseth it) the voice of one touching as it were that body, of the resurrection whereof he spake, and touching it (as the custom of his Church then was) with his finger? Nay what could he have said more than he did, if he had been never so willing to express that to be the very body which was so to be changed? What more apt expressions could he make use of, than those of *putting on incorruption and immortality*, to shew that it should notwithstanding continue the same for substance? What more apt expressions to turn men from the conceit of having another body given them? For how could it *put on* immortality and incorruption, if it were not, it may be, to be at all, but however not in the condition of a humane body? Nay might not that corruptible and mortal body, by the novel opinion of the resurrection, be much more truly said to be condemn'd to corruption and a never ending death? In fine, how came the same Apostle to infer immediately after from this affirmation of his, that by this means *death* came to be *swallowed up in victory*? For what victory could there be over death, which was allowed to hold that body under its power, over which alone it had triumph'd? So contradictorily to plain Scripture will men both speak and opine, rather than acknowledge a truth which carries any thing of dissonancy to their conceptions; Though that they may not be thought to do so, that very Scripture must be call'd in to give suffrage to them, but with how much constraint, and to how little purpose let any indifferent person judge. For can they in truth think themselves befriended by what St. Paul

<sup>h</sup> 1 Cor. 15. 36, &c. *saith in the very same Chapter<sup>b</sup>, Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickned except it die. And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain. But God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body? But first of all, in this very similitude, in which they seem so to hug themselves, there is a greater appearance of identity in the body dying and quickned, than will be for their interest to allow: Because it doth not only come up the same in kind with that which was sown (with which the supposition of ethereal bodies coming in the place of earthly doth not hold correspondence) but the body that comes up in effect no other than that which was sown, only multipli'd and augmented and adorn'd, but however which derives its being from it. It would be considered secondly that as similitudes, such as this is, are not in reason to be press'd any farther than they may appear to have been intended by the Author of them; so this which they urge had no other end than to shew what difference there should be as to quality between the bodies of men dying and rising: As may appear both by the question which it was intended for an answer to<sup>i</sup>, even *with what* or rather *with what qualifi'd<sup>k</sup> body* men should rise, and the different sorts of bodies the Apostle doth immediately after reckon up, and conformable to which he affirms the resurrection should so far be, that that which was *sown in corruption* should be *raised in incorruption*, as that which was *sown in dishonour* should be *raised in glory*. By the process of which discourse it doth appear, that as nothing else was intended by the similitude of *grain*, than that that which was sown *γυμνὸν καὶ κενόν*, or bare grain, should rise augmented and multipli'd and adorn'd, so there should be the same advantageous difference between mens dying and rising bodies; which doth rather confirm than destroy the identity of them as to the substance: He who propoeth to shew the different qualities of dying and*

<sup>h</sup> 1 Cor. 15. 36, &c.

<sup>i</sup> — 35.

<sup>k</sup> πῶς ὁμοιωται.



and rising bodies, supposing them to be the same in substance; but however saying nothing at all to overthrow it. As little will those men, who fancy the giving us other bodies than we deposite, advantage themselves by what they alledge from the same Apostle and place <sup>1</sup>, that *flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God*. For as that which follows *neither doth corruption inherit incorruption* shews the thing the Apostle intends by *flesh and blood* to be flesh and blood with its present weaknesses, so it is not unusual with the Scripture to express that which is weak by it, as is evident from several places <sup>m</sup> of it. Besides when both the nature of a resurrection and the express affirmation of St. Paul that *this mortal shall put on immortality* shews the body that shall rise to be the same in substance with that which fell; when it is the Apostles business throughout that whole chapter to shew that that which is sown shall rise, which how it could be affirmed to do, if there were a substantial difference between them, is not at all to be conceiv'd; how absurd must it needs be (especially when those words of *flesh and blood* are capable of another sense) to understand thereby that we shall have a body which is so far from being numerically the same with that which was sown, that it is not so much as of the same general nature with it? I may not omit to take notice, however not perfunctorily handled by others, of the evidence we have of the rising of the same body which we deposite, from the resurrection of that of Christ, and the place from whence those bodies of ours are affirmed to arise. For inasmuch as our resurrection is by the vertue of his, and he is in the nature of the *first-fruits* <sup>n</sup> and we as the *lump* or *after gathering*; Inasmuch as the same St. Paul tells us <sup>o</sup>, and reason no less that the *first-fruits* and the *lump* are of the same nature; our Saviour rising with the same body in which he died (as his offering it to the touch, affirming it to have flesh and bones, and shewing the wounds upon it make manifest) we also must rise in our pristine one, and so be transmitted to his heavenly Kingdom. But so the same St. Paul elsewhere <sup>p</sup> tells us that we shall, and thereby gives farther force to this inference of ours; he there affirming, that that same Jesus shall not give us new bodies, but *change our vile ones that they may be like unto his glorious body according to the mighty working whereby he is able to subdue all things to himself*. Again as our Saviour rose in the same body in which he died, and consequently we also must, so the places, from whence our bodies are foretold to arise, evidence the identity thereof. For wherefore should the Scripture <sup>q</sup> tell us, that the *graves* and other such *receptacles of the dead* should be ransack'd at the resurrection, but to let us know that the bodies, in which we shall arise, shall be no other than what we deposite there? For otherwise the graves might be allowed to be quiet, and both they and the bodies that sleep there be permitted to rest for ever.

IV. I have done with all that which hath any thing of difficulty in the present Article, and shall therefore be the more brief in my account of that which follows, and particularly of *the time when this Resurrection shall be*. For as St. Paul gives us clearly enough to understand that the resurrection was not *past* in his time, whatsoever some erroneous men then opin'd and taught (I suppose from the notice they had of that resurrection from sin to righteousness which the Scripture so often speaks of <sup>r</sup>, and which they deemed to be the only one which Christianity propos'd) so our Saviour and St. Paul sufficiently assure us, that it shall

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. 15. 50.

<sup>m</sup> Heb. 2. 14.  
<sup>n</sup> Eph. 6. 12.

<sup>n</sup> 1 Cor. 15. 23.  
<sup>o</sup> Rom. 11. 16.

<sup>p</sup> Phi. 3. 21.

<sup>q</sup> Joh. 5. 28;  
<sup>29</sup> Rev. 20. 13.

<sup>r</sup> 2 Tim. 2. 18.

<sup>r</sup> Rom. 6. 4.  
Col. 3. 1.  
Eph. 5. 14.

shall not be till the former shall come to judgment, and raise men from the dead to receive the award of it. For then, saith our Saviour<sup>c</sup>, even when I come to execute that judgment wherewith I am entrusted, shall *all that are in the graves hear my voice and come forth, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation.* And the Lord himself, saith St. Paul<sup>a</sup>, shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel and with the trump of God; and then and not till then shall the dead in Christ rise, and they who shall then be alive caught up together with them to meet the Lord in the air: At which time also (lest any should think the resurrection of evil men should not accompany the others) the same Apostle elsewhere affirms<sup>x</sup> that they *who know not God* shall be *punished with everlasting destruction*, and that they may be so therefore, according to our Saviour's doctrine be raised out of their graves; This eternal destruction being to be inflicted upon them<sup>y</sup> when Christ shall come to be so glorified as is before describ'd in his Saints, and admired in all them that believe. The only thing that can give a check to this assertion is the distinction St. John makes between a *first*<sup>z</sup> and a *second* resurrection, and to the former whereof as he allots only some peculiar persons, so he sets it a thousand years before the more general one. But as what was before so distinctly affirm'd concerning the rising of all men together ought not lightly to be either doubted of or deny'd; So much less upon the account of so obscure a book as the Revelations, and which under types and parables delivers many things which have a sense vastly different from those modes of speech under which they are expressed. For who knows but that *first resurrection* whereof St. John speaks may be a parabolical one? Nay who can lightly think otherwise, considering the enigmatical expressions of that book, and the so clear and distinct declarations of the Scripture elsewhere for one great and general resurrection? Especially, when in that *first resurrection*, whereof St. John speaks, there is mention only of certain *souls living and reigning with Christ*, and not, as in the second and more general one, of the *sea*<sup>a</sup>, as well as *death* and *Hades*, giving up those it had devour'd, and thereby, because the Sea can be thought only a receptacle of bodies, demonstrating it to be a true and proper resurrection. However that be, considering the general darkness of that book, and the enigmaticalness of its expressions, nothing can be concluded from it against more clear and distinct declarations elsewhere, and the resurrection of all at the general judgment therefore stand as safe and untouch'd, as if it had no such umbrage to obscure or invalidate it.

V. From the time of the resurrection therefore pass we to the *subjects* of it, and which will soon appear to be all that shall have died until then (unless you except only those who rose together with our Saviour :) Partly upon the account of those whether indefinite or general terms the Scripture makes use of to denote them (for it represents this resurrection, as a resurrection<sup>b</sup> of the dead, of the<sup>c</sup> just and unjust, of all<sup>d</sup> that are in the graves, and in fine of all that the *Sea*<sup>e</sup> or *death* or *Hades* have devoured) but more especially upon the account of that judgment<sup>f</sup> to which the resurrection leads, and to which it is design'd to bring men. For the resurrection being not only in order to a future judgment, but necessary to bring the dead before it, who yet must appear there<sup>g</sup> as well as those who shall be then alive; if *all must appear before that judgment*, as the Scripture

<sup>c</sup> Joh. 5.27,&c.

<sup>a</sup> 1 Thes. 4. 16, 17.

<sup>x</sup> 2 Thes. 1.9.

<sup>y</sup> — 10.

<sup>z</sup> Rev. 20.4,5.

<sup>a</sup> — 13.

<sup>b</sup> 1 Cor. 15.42.

<sup>c</sup> Act. 24. 15.

<sup>d</sup> Joh. 5. 28,

29.

<sup>e</sup> Rev. 20.13.

<sup>f</sup> Joh. 5.28,&c.

<sup>g</sup> 2 Tim. 4.1.

Scripture assures us<sup>1</sup> they must, all that die must, in order to it, become<sup>2</sup> the subjects of that resurrection, which both the *Creed* and the *Scripture* oblige us to believe. If there be any to whom this resurrection shall not appertain, they must be those whom the *last day* shall then find *alive*, and concerning whom we are assur'd that they shall *not die but be changed*<sup>3</sup>, and therefore neither need to be, nor shall be partakers of this resurrection. But other than those as we have no reason at all to believe to be excepted from that resurrection whereof we speak, so we shall have much less, if we consider the different qualifications of those who are to rise. For all they, who are members of Christ's body, are of necessity to rise, if it were only for the farther glory of him to whom they appertain, and without the restitution and happiness of whom this head of theirs cannot be completely happy; And all they, that are not members of his body, yea either strangers or enemies both to him and it, that so they may be in a full capacity to receive the award of that judgment, with the power whereof he is invested. The only thing that hath hitherto made any semblance of prejudicating so general a resurrection, is the Prophet *Daniel's*<sup>4</sup> affirming that *many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt*. For that may seem to intimate, that all that sleep in the dust of the earth shall not, partly upon the account of his affirming this *awaking* rather of *many* than *all*, and partly because the particle *ו* or *ex* in מִי־שָׁנָי (Multi מִי־שָׁנָי seu è dormientibus in pulverulenta terra) imports the *many* before spoken of to be taken out from the number of those that sleep in the dust of the earth, and consequently that that *awaking*, or resurrection which is attributed to them, doth not belong to all of it. But beside that the Prophet *Daniel* comprehends both good and bad in the resurrection, which is sufficiently contrary to a maxim of many of those *Jewes* by whom this place is urged, even that *though the benefit of the rain be common to the just and wicked, yet the resurrection of the dead belongs only to the just*; Beside that, when the resurrection is in order to a judgment, yea to a judgment of good and bad, no reason can be assign'd why all should not partake of it, and the judgment that follows upon it, proportionably to the degrees of their either goodness or wickedness; The words of the Prophet *Daniel* may import no more<sup>5</sup>, than that of those that sleep in the dust of the earth many shall awake to everlasting life, and many again to shame and everlasting contempt: So making the word *many* not to divide between those that awake and those that awake not, as if all that sleep in the dust should not; but between the different conditions of those that are to be awaked; because though all that sleep shall awake, yet not all to the same state, but many of them, suitably to their past piety, to everlasting life, and many again, yea more, agreeably to their former ill behaviour, to a state of shame and everlasting contempt. Which interpretation had yet been more clear and undoubted, if agreeably to the letter of the *Hebrew* text, the words had been rendred thus, *And many of those that sleep in the earth shall awake, these to everlasting life, and those to shame and everlasting contempt*. For so the word *many* might have been appli'd to each sort of those who are here foretold to awake, and the sence of the text have been no other than this; that, whereas there should be two sorts of men that should awake from the sleep of death, many of each sort should be roused out of it, but with this difference, that the many of the

<sup>2</sup> 2 Cor. 4. 10.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Cor. 15. 51, 52.

<sup>4</sup> Dan. 12. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Vid. Huls. Theol. Judaicæ part. 1. li. 4. pag. 178.



<sup>m</sup> Huls. *ibid.*  
pag. 169, &c.  
in Dr Pocock's  
Append. ad  
Port. Moshi c.  
6. pag. 180.  
&c.

the one sort should awake to everlasting life, but *the many* of the other to as lasting a shame and contempt. However, as those words of the Prophet cannot much advantage the *Jews* against us, till they come to be better agreed among themselves, than it appears <sup>m</sup> they are, who are to be excepted out of the number of those that shall awake; so they will much less avail toward the overthrow of that faith of ours, which hath so many and much more clear texts of the *New Testament* to found it self upon. Instead therefore of concerning my self any farther about the solution of them, I shall choose rather to admonish men, in respect to that judgment which follows upon the resurrection, to look well to their lives and actions; That so they may be found among those who shall rise to everlasting life, and not among those who shall only awake, to suffer shame and everlasting contempt.

## And the Life everlasting.

### The Contents.

*After an account of the necessity of this Article of our belief in order to life and manners, enquiry is made first, from whence this everlasting life commenceth, which is shewn to be from the time of the resurrection; Secondly, what appearance there is of its belonging both to good and bad, which is in like manner evidenced, as from other Topicks, so from the most ancient accounts we have of the Creed; Thirdly, what portions it assigns to each of these, together with the eternity thereof. The sad portion of evil men brought first under consideration, where again is shewn that their bodies shall have a great share in it, and that they shall be punished with fire. The punishment of their souls in like manner considered, and shewn what those punishments are. A conclusion of the whole with an account of the eternity of those punishments, and that eternity both cleared out of the Scriptures, and asserted from the objections that are made against it. Of the portion which Everlasting life assigns to good men, where again is shewn that they shall be delivered from all grief and misery, and enstated in all that is truly and perfectly good. A more minute account of the particular happinesses of that life, together with a proof of the eternity thereof.*

And the  
Life ever-  
lasting.

**I**F the resurrection of the body were not in order to some future state which should be suited to the several demerits of those that rise, the consideration thereof might perhaps serve to exercise our faith, but it would contribute little toward the regulating of our lives. For what inducement could it be to a severe piety to tell men that they should rise again, when it may be that life, to which they should be rais'd, should be altogether as miserable as the present? Or what determent from sin and impiety, which should perhaps only restore the guilty person to the same sensuality and luxury, in which he had rioted before? If the resurrection

resurrection promised nothing else; it would have been all one to the purposes of religion, as if there should be none at all, and we might as rationally conclude; *let us eat and drink* for we shall rise again, as *let us do so* because we shall shortly die. Again, if that future state, to which the resurrection leads, were but a *temporary* one, if the happiness or unhappiness which it bringeth were *to have an end*, neither would the righteous man be so fond of his portion in it, as to neglect his present satisfaction, or the unrighteous so dread his punishment as to make him strip himself of his present enjoyments, and court an assured trouble. For be it that *that* misery shall far surpass all that we can here expect; be it that it shall continue for a much longer period, than either our present hopes or fears: yet being so far removed from us as well as temporary, the present pleasures of sin may seem to challenge the precedence, and *we eat and drink* in spite of the resurrection, and the supposed punishment that is to follow it. This however is certain, that the temporariness of our future either happiness or unhappiness would be a considerable abatement to our hopes and fears, and therefore to establish each of these it was but necessary, that as there should be a *life of weal and woe* after this, so that that life should be *ever lasting*.

In the handling of which *last Article* of the *Creed* I will proceed in this method.

1. I will enquire from what time this *everlasting life* commenceth.
2. What appearance there is of its belonging both to *good* and *bad*.
3. The *different portions* it assigns to each of these, together with the *eternity* thereof.

1. As concerning the *time* from which this everlasting life is to commence the *Article* as it is now plac'd will not suffer us to doubt; How much less, if we consider how it hath been sometime express'd, or the account the Scripture gives us of it? For being even now subjoin'd to the mention of that *resurrection*, which as it supposeth a precedent death, so implies a restitution unto life, it gives us reason enough to believe that it is to begin from that time, wherein the resurrection shall be accomplished. For what place could there be for the beginning of *eternal life* before, when a resurrection as such supposeth the person, to whom it is attributed, to have been before under the state of death? Or what doubt of its commencing presently after, when the same resurrection to which it is subjoin'd implies a restoration unto life? That in a manner constraining us to fix the beginning of this life in the resurrection, as which otherwise it would have been very unreasonably, that I say not also insidiously subjoin'd to. Thus, I say, the *Article* as it now stands prompts us to reason, neither could men have well fix'd any other beginning to it, though they had nothing else but the present placing of it to prompt them to it; How much less, when they are assur'd that this *eternal life* was some time made but an appendix to the former *Article*, and that *resurrection*, to which it is now subjoin'd, represented in express terms <sup>a</sup> as a *resurrection to it*; In fine, when that more Authentick, as well as more explicate *Creed*, the Scripture, makes it to depend upon that <sup>b</sup> sentence which the Son of man shall give when he shall come to judge the world (which we understand elsewhere <sup>c</sup> the resurrection to make way for) yea represents it as the consequent thereof? For then, saith the Prophet *Daniel* <sup>d</sup>, shall they *that sleep in the earth* awake, *some to everlasting life* and *some to shame* and *as lasting a contempt*. If there be any thing that may be suppos'd to prejudice this B.

<sup>a</sup> See Pearson upon the Creed.

<sup>b</sup> Mat. 25. 46.

<sup>c</sup> Joh. 5. 29.

<sup>d</sup> Dan. 12. 2.

<sup>a</sup> Joh. 5. 24. *poche*, it must be our *Saviours* affirming • that he that believeth in him and him that sent him hath everlasting life already, yea, both actually <sup>f</sup> Heb. 12. 23. *pass'd from death to it*, as his *Apostle's*, that the *spirits of just men*, presently after their departure hence, enter upon *perfection*, and may therefore (because to be sure they shall never fall back from it) be so far at least presum'd to have enter'd upon everlasting life. But as it is no inconvenience to understand our Saviour of the believers having a right to, rather than being actually possessed of it (for where a man's title to any thing is such, that he cannot without his own great neglect be disseized, he may seem to be already enter'd upon it) so though we should take both our *Saviours* and the former *Apostle's* words in the strictest notion they are capable of, yet would they not prejudice the intendment of the *Creed*. He who believeth on the Son of man hath indeed *everlasting life* begun in him, as to that part of it which consists in Piety and Holiness; He, whose spirit is now made perfect, is so far forth enter'd also upon that part of it, which consists in bliss and happiness: But forasmuch as our holiness here is but imperfect, and even after this life our happiness can be but incomplete, till the resurrection of the body, therefore till that time we cannot truly and perfectly be said to begin that life which is *everlasting*, that is to say till the whole man doth.

II. An account being thus given of the time from which this everlasting life commenceth, enquire we in the next place what appearance there is of its belonging both to *good* and *bad*. The ground of which enquiry is the peculiarity there seems to be in the title of *everlasting life* to express the happy condition of the former. For as it must be confess'd that no other condition than theirs can well deserve the name of life, because no other than theirs hath the conveniences of life annexed to it; so the Scripture, even where it attributes an eternal state to wicked men, yet is so far from giving it the title of *everlasting life*, that it makes use of that title to distinguish the happy state of good men from that of the wicked and unjust. For thus we find the Prophet *Daniel* <sup>a</sup> opposing *everlasting life*, to *shame and everlasting contempt*, as our *Saviour* <sup>b</sup> after him distinguishing the *resurrection of life* (for so he entitles that of good men) from the others *resurrection unto damnation*. But as they, who shall consider the relation this Article hath unto the former, will find themselves oblig'd to consider the *everlasting life* here spoken of, as appertaining both to good and bad (for if *everlasting life* be the end of that resurrection which is before asserted, it must consequently, because that resurrection respects good and bad, be thought to comprehend in it the state both of the one and the other) So it is apparent enough it was so understood by those, in whom we find the first expresses of the *Creed*. For thus we find *Irenaeus*, in that account which he gives of this faith of the Church, representing it as one great Article thereof, that Christ should *send the Apostate Angels and ungodly men into eternal fire*, as well as *give immortality and eternal glory to the just and holy*, and *Tertullian* after him affirming concerning the same Christ, that *having restor'd good and bad to their former circumstances by the resurrection of the flesh*, he should *adjudge the profane to a perpetual fire*, as well as *take the saints into the possession of everlasting life*. If the *Creed*, as it doth, made use of such a phrase, as was in itself more expressive of the future state of good men than of that of bad, it was not so much to exclude the consideration of the latter, as to prompt men

<sup>a</sup> Dan. 12. 2.

<sup>b</sup> Joh. 5. 29.

<sup>c</sup> See for both the Introduction and the Explication of the Apost. Creed.



men to consider, that the former of these was that which was *primarily* intended by God and Christ, and that it must be their own great fault if they fell short of it, and receiv'd everlasting punishment instead of it. Taking it therefore for granted, that the *everlasting life* here spoken of was intended to denote the future condition both of good and bad, I will forthwith set my self to shew the *different portions* it assigns to each of these, together with the *eternity* thereof.

III. Now though, if we consider the *phrase* which is here made use of to describe them both, we should in reason give the precedency to the *portion of good men*, as to which this title of *everlasting life* may seem most properly to appertain; Yet because I should be thereby oblig'd to shut up my discourse with a very unpleasant argument, which is a *solecism* that Historians so carefully avoid; that they choose rather to leave their History imperfect, than so to end, therefore I will for once invert the order of those things whereof I am to entreat, and give the precedency to their condition which seems least intended here. In order whereunto, I will first of all give an account of the *portion of evil men*, and then of the *eternity* thereof.

I. Now as there is nothing which evil men do more concern themselves for, than their *bodies*, and which therefore they may be more alarm'd at, than at the news of the punishment of them; so I shall therefore represent to them in the *first* place, that these, as well as their Souls, shall have their portion in that state, which I am now going to describe. For wherefore else should those bodies of theirs be rais'd, as well as the bodies of better men? Wherefore should God be at the expence of so great a miracle to restore them? Such loathed things, as the bodies of evil men, being much more worthy of that dust in which they are wrap'd up, than of being restored to a life, which they made so ill an use of. And indeed, as our Saviour sufficiently intimates the end of *that* to be their punishment, when he affirms that those evil men that sleep in the grave shall come forth to the resurrection of damnation; so, to give them yet more quick apprehensions of it, he reminds them elsewhere of God's *ability to cast both body<sup>1</sup> and soul into hell*, as again, where he presseth them with the cutting off an offending limb, that it is much *more profitable to suffer the loss of that<sup>m</sup>*, than *to have the whole body cast into hell*.<sup>2</sup> For to what purpose would such advertisements as these have been, if that hell, whereof we speak, were not to be the portion of evil bodies? Nay who can think them to have been intended, especially the latter of them, as other than an affirmation of it? Because how preferable soever it may be to lose a limb, than to have the whole body so tormented, yet would no man of reason venture it, if he were not pretty well assur'd, that that should be consequent thereof: The former being a certain as well as a present loss, whereas the other would be a very remote as well as a contingent one. Either therefore our Saviour by those sayings of his alarmed the world with a very ineffectual threat (which reverence to his person, as well as his express declarations elsewhere forbid us to believe) or he meant to say that the bodies of evil men should have a share in the torments of Hell, as well as be in a possibility of falling under them.

But because how well soever men may be satisfied concerning the punishment of their beloved bodies, yet that knowledge may not avail much, unless they be also in some measure acquainted with the either nature

\* Mat. 18. 8.

29. 41.

\* Jude 7. cum  
Annot. Grot. ad  
locum.\* Tert. Apol.  
cap. 47.

\* Mat. 25. 41.

\* 2 King. 23. 10.

ture or exquisiteness thereof, therefore enquire we, if it may be had, after such a knowledge of the one and the other, as may keep us at least from a future but far worse understanding of them. It is sufficiently known to those, to whom the Scriptures but superficially are, that those torments, whereof we speak, are most commonly represented under the notion of an *everlasting* fire. But whether the Scripture intended that as a rigid character of them, or only as a thing by which to represent to us the painfulness thereof, hath been the matter of a dispute; yea so far (which is both to be wondred at, and lamented) as to call in question the reality of all. I must profess my self to be in the number of those who have a great veneration for the letter of the Scripture, and which therefore without great necessity I do not love to depart from. But that which makes me the more tenacious of it here, is *first* the assurance we have both from the general design of the resurrection, and the former assertions of the Scripture, that the bodies of men shall be exquisitely tormented. For that suppos'd, how can any man not think that to be one of the punishments of Hell, which is so generally and almost constantly represented as an instrument of it? That as it is no improper punishment of a body, so being one of the most exquisite ones. I am the more confirmed in that notion *secondly* from what I find St. *Jude* affirming concerning the fire of *Sodom* and *Gomorrha*, and which he represents as an *image* of the punishment of *everlasting* fire. For as it is certain that the fire by which those Cities were consum'd was a true and real one, so it is therefore but reasonable to believe that that eternal fire is no less, which this of *Sodom* and *Gomorrha* was intended as a representation of. Lastly I am confirmed in it by the consentient belief of the Ancient Christians, and particularly by those expresses of it which are to be met with in their *Apologesicks*, and where, if any where, we may expect a faithful account of their general belief. For not only doth *Tertullian* in his *p* represent it as his own sense that the fire of Hell was a true and real one, but as a sense which was embrac'd by all that call'd themselves Christians, and for which they were all alike derided by the adversaries of their common Faith. If there be any thing to take us off from so receiv'd a sense, and so far as the *letter of the Scripture* can do it, a well establish'd one; It must be the inconsistency thereof with some other accounts, which are given by the same Scripture concerning it. Though of all that hath been urg'd nothing seems to me to have any thing of difficulty in it, but its being said to be primarily prepar'd for the devil, and his Angels, and to whom as being Spirits that cannot be conceiv'd to be any proper punishment. For is it that the word *geenna* or *Hell* is but another word, only varied a little by the Greek, for the *vally of Hinnom*, and where as they were wont to cause their children to pass through the fire to *Moloch*, so the dreadfulnes thereof may seem to have been the only reason of the Ancients describing *Hell* by the fire of it? But as the fire of *Sodom* and *Gomorrha* were represented by St. *Jude* as an image of the eternal one, so possibly the same reason might prevail to give the *Hell* of the damned the same appellation of *geenna*, because of their congenial fires. Is it then that the punishments of the damned are represented as everlasting, and cannot therefore be suppos'd to be the issue of fire, as which will soon reduce to ashes those bodies it hath to do with? But beside that God hath preserv'd some bodies from being at all touch'd by the fire, and may therefore preserve these, though not from the sense, yet from

from dissolution by it; It is not hard to suppose, especially in that world of wonders, but that God may by his Almighty power repair those bodies as fast as they are consum'd. A notion which as I acknowledge to have borrowed from *Tertullian*, so I know not how better to express than in the words of his *Apologestick*<sup>1</sup>. For after he had said that the worshippers of God are always with him, clothed upon with an eternal substance, he adds that the profane, and those who cleave not entirely unto God, are condemn'd to the punishment of as lasting a fire, receiving from the nature of it, which is in a manner divine, the supply of their incorruptibility. The Philosophers as well as we know the difference there is between secret fire, and that which is exposed to our eyes. Thus the fire ordain'd for the use of man is other than that which serves for the judgment of God, whether it forms the lightning which beaven darts, or that which belcheth out of the earth through the tops of mountains. For it doth not consume that which it burns, but whilst it destroys repairs. Though if all that should pass for wit only, or at best but a faint resemblance of what we may suppose God will then do; yet have we enough to oppose to any man, who will be but constant to himself in the belief of an everlasting punishment. For if it be a prejudice to the usual notion of Hell-fire, that it would in time reduce the body to nothing, and so defeat an eternal punishment, it is no more than may be alledg'd against any constant pain, which the damned may be suppos'd to be vexed withall; It being of the nature of that to consume the person who is grieved with it, no less than that subtle element of fire. In fine ought we to be removed from this notion by that blackness and darkness which is equally predicated of Hell, and which seems not well consistent with so bright a punishment as that of fire? But as I will not deny but that and some other descriptions of Hell may rather be made use of to comply with our present conceptions of things, than prompt us to understand them in the better; so I think it no argument to conclude from thence that all are, and particularly that by which it is most usually described. If therefore there be any thing to impugn the received notion of Hell-fire, it must be its being primarily prepar'd for the Devil and his Angels, and to whom, as being spirits, it may seem to be no proper punishment. But as men ought to be better satisfi'd concerning the nature of evil Angels (than I doubt they will be here) before they pronounce too peremptorily what is or is not to be accounted a proper punishment of them; so what if we should understand our Saviour, especially when he bids evil men depart into it, rather of the place wherein that fire burneth, and wherein Devils as well as evil men shall be punished, than of that fire which burneth in it? For so hell will appear to be properly enough design'd for them, and yet the fire, which shall at length be enkindled in it, be reserv'd for those who by reason of their corporeity may seem to be more susceptible of its force.

But let us suppose (for I see no necessity at all of granting it) that the fire of hell was intended rather as a resemblance of the punishments thereof, than as an instrument whereby they shall be prov'd; yet will not that afford any relief to the sinful man, no not as to those corporal evils, which he so much desires to be deliver'd from. For as, if there be but truth in the resemblance, it will prove the inflicting of evils which are no way inferior to that which happens to men by fire, so it will serve as well to infer (because men shall suffer in their bodies as well as Souls) the



the inflicting of the like evils there. Which notion I am yet more confirmed in, partly because the Scripture doth mostwhat make use of sensible evils to denote the punishments of hell, and partly because the senses, being the inlets of our temptations, may reasonably be presum'd to be made the instruments of our punishment. For what is there almost that can bring any displeasure to our senses, which is not to be found in the black catalogue of hell torments? Is *darkness* and *gloominess* uncomfortable to the *eye*, yea to such a degree that it is often made use of to represent the most dismal condition by? He that is cast into that place, is said to be cast into *outer darkness*, that is to say, a darkness as thick, as that which was to be found out of the dwellings of the *Israelites* in *Egypt*, and from which it is not improbable that expression of *outer darkness* was borrowed. Is *fire* offensive to the *touch*? Hell seems to be compos'd of nothing else, so frequently is it made use of to represent the torments of it. Is there any *fire* which is also offensive to the *scent*, the fire of hell is no less, as being kindled and maintain'd by *brimstone*? Lastly are doleful shrieks and sad cries offensive to the ear? Hell is full of *weeping and wailing*<sup>1</sup>; and men partake not only of their own griefs, but of those of others. And though I will not now say but some of these may be metaphorical expressions, and accordingly made use of rather as emblems of the damns sufferings, than as a strict and proper character of them; Yet forasmuch as we are assur'd that the body shall suffer torment and the senses are the inlets of it; forasmuch as those senses have been the inlets of temptations, and the instruments of those sins for which both Soul and Body are punished; it is but reasonable to believe, that, in that state of misery and unhappiness, each of these shall meet with their particular dissatisfactions, and, if not those which the Scripture remembers, yet such as are no way inferior to them. The same I may reasonably affirm concerning the appetites of *thirst* and *hunger*, as not only being fit instruments of torture, but having been instruments of sin: And therefore neither can I find any difficulty to interpret our Saviour in the letter, when he saith *Wo unto you that are full, for ye shall hunger*; nor wholly despise the fiction of *Tantalus* whom the *Poets* describe catching, but in vain, at those waters that ran by him, and at those apples also which fled from him. For if the body be to suffer torment as well as the Soul, as Christianity obligeth us to believe, I know not with what reason we can exclude the several senses and appetites of it from receiving their particular disgusts. And then let him, who hath but sense left, judge how miserable the condition of the damned shall be, who shall at once receive in torment at every one.

I have done with those punishments which respect the *bodies* of the damned, and am therefore to take notice of those which shall be inflicted upon their *souls*; These, as they are the root and fountain of all impiety, so being therefore no doubt to partake proportionably of the evil consequents thereof. Where again we will consider their both great loss, and more uncomfortable acquisitions, the signal happiness whereof they are depriv'd, and that miserable anxiety and trouble of mind which they infallibly procure. How great an infelicity the former of these involves will then best appear, when we come to declare that both happiness and glory to which holy Souls shall be advanc'd. It may suffice here briefly to note, that as the *right*<sup>2</sup> and *Kingdom of God*<sup>3</sup> are made the portion of holy Souls, in which number to be sure those of the damned no way

<sup>1</sup> Mat. 8. 12.<sup>2</sup> Rev. 21. 8.<sup>3</sup> Mat. 8. 12.<sup>4</sup> Luke 6. 25.<sup>2</sup> Mat. 5. 8.<sup>3</sup> ——— 3.

way are, so the least that is said of unrighteous ones is, that they shall not inherit that Kingdom<sup>b</sup> to which the other are prefer'd. Such is the loss which all damped Souls sustain; but no way inferior thereto is that anxiety and trouble of mind which the consideration of their past sins and present circumstances shall then be sure to give them. For if this even here be the consequent of sin, where the conscience is not blinded or fear'd, how may we think it will then be when the veil shall be taken from before their eyes, and men shall both see and feel their guilt? And

<sup>b</sup> 1 Cor. 6. 9.  
Gal. 5. 21.

though I am not altogether of his mind<sup>\*</sup> who made the furies whereof the heathen spake to be no other than the guilty mans own fraud and impiety, and the disquiets which the consideration thereof gives; Yet as it is not impossible that even those dismal furies may have in part been made use of to represent the disquiets of guilty minds, so I cannot think the troubles of those, especially in the other world, to be any whit less than what such furies may be supposed to produce. For when a man shall see no-

<sup>\*</sup> Tull. Orat. pro Roscio Amerino. Nolite enim putari, quemadmodum in fabulis sepe videtis, eos qui aliquid impie sceleratq; commiserint, agitari & perterri furiarum sedis grandine. Sua quaque fraus & sua prae se habet vixat; suum quaque scelus agitat; amentiaq; afficit; sua male cogitationis conscientiaq; torquent. Ha sunt impiis alidae domesticaeque furiae, &c.

thing in himself but villany and impiety, nor any thing without him but indignation and vengeance; when he shall consider how easie it sometime was for him to have escap'd it, and how utterly impossible it shall then be; when he shall see those whom he hath despis'd, and it may be oppress'd, advanc'd to the right hand of our Saviour, and made assessors with him in the judgment, whilst he himself is consign'd to the punishment of a malefactor, and made to suffer both with and by those evil spirits whom he hath formerly serv'd; How is it possible to think, but that indignation and grief and despair thus meeting together, should give the Soul of that man an unusual disquiet, and such, as, I do not say no supposed furies could produce in him, but no torture of body is any way comparable to. And if this be likely to be, or rather undoubtedly shall be the state of the damned, let those, who make so much haste to it, consider whether any present pleasures can compensate it; especially if they also take into their thoughts, what I come now to shew, even the everlastingness thereof.

It is a noted story and may be of signal use to any whom the fear of temporal evils is apt to deter from their obedience. One *Biblias*<sup>c</sup>, who had through the fear of Martyrdom renounc'd her Saviour and her Religion, was brought by her Executioners to the place of torment, as supposing that the sight of that would have induced her to blaspheme them also. But behold here a quite contrary effect, and by which she triumph'd no less over her own weakness, than over the others malicious hopes. For considering with her self, how, if a temporal punishment were so irksome, an everlasting punishment in Hell must be much more so, instead of blaspheming her Religion, she publicly defended it, and added her self to the number of the Martyrs. The consideration, from how weak a person soever it proceeded, was certainly prudent, and such as might well have become the reason of a man; For what proportion can that, which is at worst but of a finite continuance, bear to that which shall never have an end? If there were any error in her ratiocination, it was in the foundation of it, and supposing that to be everlasting which is not such. A thing yet, which among Christians can hardly admit of a dispute, so frequent mention is there in their Scriptures of the eternity thereof. Only because *Origen* first, and after him others have set bounds

<sup>c</sup> Euseb. Eccl. Hist. li. 5. c. 1

bounds to this eternity, we will a little more nearly consider it; and shew it to admit of none.

<sup>a</sup> Isa. 40. 28.  
Rom. 16. 26.

And here in the *first* place I shall take it for granted, that the word *aiōnios* or *everlasting* doth not only signifie a thing of long duration, but such also as shall never have an end; This being made use of<sup>d</sup> to expresse the *eternity of God*, which is certainly without any limits whatsoever. I shall take it for granted *secondly*, because sufficiently evident from the force of the word *aiōnios*, that when it signifies a limited eternity, yet the thing to which it is attributed is supposed to coextend to the whole of that *aiōn* or *age* in which it is affirmed to exist. *Lastly*, I shall take it for granted, because neither deni'd by any, nor, for ought that doth appear, can there be any ground for it, I shall, I say, take it for granted that the life and happiness of the blessed is strictly and unlimitedly eternal, that it is not only of a long duration but without end. Which suppos'd, it will not be difficult to shew, even from the force of the former concessions, that the torments of the damned are of the same continuance. For being the word *everlasting* is capable of signifying an absolute eternity, being there appears not any other age after that of the damns torments, which might be suppos'd to put any limit to it or them, lastly being it is express'd by the same word, and oftentimes too in the same *period*, by which the eternity of happiness is, it is but reasonable to think it to be of the same nature with it, and that the punishment of the one no more than the life of the other shall have an end. Otherwise the making use of one and the same word, as that too in the very same period, to describe both the one and the other eternity must have been very absurd, because leaving no place for conjecture that there was any distinction between them. How much more absurd then the *Creed's* making use of that one phrase of *life everlasting* to denote both the one and the other's continuance? For by how much the less is left by the *Creed* to ground any difference of duration on, so much the less reason is there to believe that it intended any difference in it, or indeed any *other* difference than what the quality of mens past demerits, as well as the known doctrine of Christianity would of themselves lead us to the acknowledgment of.

<sup>b</sup> Mat. 25. 46.

One only thing there is, which seems to me to prejudice this eternity, and which I suppose to have been the only reason why it came to be called in question; I mean the difficulty of conceiving, how so everlasting a punishment could come to be made the reward of the impieties of such a life, as must be confess'd to hold so little proportion to it. For what proportion can the sins of a very short life, or at least in comparison with the other, bear to an eternity of torment? And if there be none, where is the justice of him that inflicts it, that I say not also, where are the expresses of that signal love and kindness, which nature as well as Scripture prompts us to believe to be lodged in him? For answer to which we are first to know that no rule of justice requires that there should be a proportion between the time of the punishment, and that wherein the sin or sins chastiz'd were perpetrated. Otherwise (as St. *Augustine*<sup>e</sup> at large discourses) no punishment almost could be just, but that which hath the nature of a *retaliation*. For setting aside death which hath the nature of an eternal punishment, because depriving the suffering person for ever of the conveniences of the present life; Is there any thing more usual than to punish a malefactor with a long and tedious imprisonment,

<sup>e</sup> Di civit. Dei  
li. 21. c. 11.

or



or a perpetual banishment from his country? Is there any Magistrate, how nice so ever, who scruples the inflicting them, or any subject, provided he be also considerate, who faults him for it? Now what justice could there be in these or any of the like nature, if the time of the punishment were not to exceed that wherein the offence was committed? The offence oftentimes being one single act, or if more, yet perpetrated within a much less time, than the Magistrate takes to punish it. I say Secondly; that as no rule of justice requires that there should be a proportion between the time of the punishment, and that wherein the sin or sins to be chastis'd were perpetrated; So the utmost it can be thought to require is, that there be, upon the whole matter, a due proportion between the punishment, and the merit of the offence for which it is inflicted. But so there may be, though the time of the punishment exceed that of the commission of the offence. The guilt of any fact being not only to be measur'd by the time wherein it is done, but by all other the circumstances thereof. All therefore that remains for us to enquire is whether such a proportion be here observ'd, and whether the sins of the damned be to be thought of so deep a dy as to deserve an eternal punishment. Which that they are, the great justice of the person against whom they are committed, and his own denouncing an eternal punishment against them, seems to me of more force to perswade, than all other the most plausible reasons against it: Because it is more certain to us, that God is a God of exact and perfect justice, than it can be, by any ratiocinations of ours, what the several merits of those mens offences are, against whom an eternal punishment is denounc'd. Only that I may not seem wholly to wave the solution of that difficulty, which the *eternity* of the damned's punishment hath entangled the minds of men withal, I shall offer to their consideration God's proposing eternal life to them as well as an eternal punishment, and, which is more, his putting it into their power to choose the one, and avoid the other. For being God makes a tender of eternal life as well as denounceth against them an eternal punishment; being he puts it into their power to choose the one and avoid the other, yea useth all necessary means which are conducive to those ends, or proper to a rational nature, what can be more just, than that, if men will yet choose everlasting punishment, they should undergoe it, and receive that portion which they have so foolishly and perversly chosen? This seeming to make that eternal punishment more the object of their own election, than the result either of God's justice or displeasure. Far less am I concern'd at what is commonly objected against this eternity, from that signal benevolence, which is suppos'd to lodge in the divine nature: Because whatever necessity may lie upon us to acknowledge the being of it, yet there is no necessity to think, that, after it hath long but in vain expected the amendment of the sinner, it should not at length give way to the inflicting of that punishment, how grievous soever, which ungrateful as well as sinful man may be thought to have deserv'd. Thus though we should never so much consider either God's justice or benevolence, yet shall we find nothing which may persuade us that there shall ever be an end of the damned's punishment; And then the only relief or comfort that can be given to sinful man, is so to order his present life and actions, that he come not into that place of torments.

2. I have done with that part of the *Article* which respects the *damned* and their *torments*, and describ'd out to you both the nature and

the eternity thereof ; Pass we on therefore to consider it with reference to *holy and blessed men*, and with respect to whom this *Article* was no doubt especially intended : Partly because their future condition, and their's alone is worthy of the name of *everlasting life*, and partly because the Scripture doth not only appropriate that name to *it*, but makes use of it to distinguish their condition from that of the others. Where first of all I will consider the happy portion it assigns good men, and then the eternity thereof.

And here not to say that the *everlasting life* here spoken of is not to be look'd upon either as a simple or a miserable one ; partly because that to which evil men shall be rais'd is as truly a life as the other's, and partly because the Scripture doth every where oppose this *everlasting life* to an *everlasting punishment* : Not to say moreover, that we cannot look upon this everlasting life as other than a glorious and happy one ; both because the most Ancient accounts <sup>a</sup> we have of the Creed and of this Article represent it as such, and because the Scripture, even where it mentions it under this notion, represents it also <sup>b</sup> under the notion of a *Kingdom* : I shall set my self to enquire into the particular happiness thereof, whether as that may be thought to denote the absence of all grief and misery, or an enjoyment of all that is truly and perfectly good.

Of the former of these there can be no doubt to any man who hath ever perus'd the *Revelations* of St. *John*, he where he describes this most blessed estate, and that *new Jerusalem* wherein it shall be celebrated, telling us that *God shall wipe away<sup>c</sup> all tears from the eyes* of the inhabitants of it, and that *there shall be no more death nor sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain*. A happiness which we need not go to the damned to learn the value of ; so clear documents are there of it even in this vale of tears. For is there any thing the miserable man thinks too dear to part with to obtain even this privative happiness, any wealth which he would not throw away to procure it ? Nay are not men content to buy the absence of pain with pain it self, and, as *Martial* wittily expresseth it, even *die that they may not* ? In fine do not men rejoice at the removal of it, as if they had obtain'd some real acquisition, and, as the *Greeks* express it <sup>k</sup>, made a gain of their misfortunes. Now if even a temporary and partial freedom from pain and misery be so great a happiness (as certainly men would not otherwise pay so dear for, or triumph in it) what may we think it to be to be freed from it for ever, to be assur'd of a perfect deliverance from it ? To be assur'd that all tears shall be wiped from our eyes, that all the causes thereof shall be wiped away together with them ? To be assur'd that there shall be no more pain to vex or torment the body, no more cares or anxious thoughts to disquiet and disturb the soul ? To be assur'd of a deliverance from the second death as well as the first, and by which though men are always dying yet they shall never die, where they are ever hastening to, but can never reach a grave ? For surely if a freedom from any pain be to be accounted a happiness, a freedom from all these, as being an accumulation of all, may very well claim that title and our desires ; and the dark side of everlasting life prove much more specious, than sin and worldly pleasure's most glittering one.

From this *nothing*, this *privative* part of happiness pass we to that which is *real* and *positive*, even those many and perfect good things wherewith eternal life is attended ; where again I will reflect upon those resemblances

<sup>a</sup> See the Introduction to the Apostles Creed.

<sup>b</sup> Mat. 25. 34--46.

<sup>c</sup> Rev. 21. 4.

<sup>k</sup> Vid. Aët. 27. 21. καὶ ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι θάνατος καὶ πένθος καὶ ἰσχυρία. cum not. Casaub. in locum.

resemblances by which they are describ'd, and then enquire so far, as I may, what those particular good things are.

And here in the first place it is not to be forgotten, because frequently represented under that notion, that the joyes, into which the righteous enter, are describ'd under the similitude of a *Kingdom*<sup>1</sup>, and in which too those righteous ones have not only the lower place of *subjects* (which yet is a great part of happiness, where the Kingdom is great and glorious) but that of *Kings*<sup>m</sup> and Princes. Now there are two things<sup>n</sup> which are chiefly considerable in a Kingdom, but especially in those persons which have the principality in it, that is to say power, and glory. I give the first place to power, because without that a Kingdom is an empty title, yea a title which serves rather to dishonour than grace the party that wears it; whence it is, that some men who were aspiring enough, have been contented that others should carry that, whilst they themselves enjoy'd its power and command. But such is not the Kingdom which Christianity proposeth, no not in these its inferiour rulers. For even with those lesser Monarchs there is also power, and such to which the mightiest Monarchs upon earth have not been able to attain. A power over themselves and all those passions which shall be then left them, a power over their great enemy and the King of terrors death, lastly a power over him who is the King of that King even Satan and his evil angels, and who though they now triumph over, shall one day come to be *judged by*<sup>n</sup> them. Neither is the Kingdom here promised<sup>n</sup> a Kingdom of power only (which yet to a rational ambition is the most desirable) but such as may gratifie those who are most fond of the ensigns of it, and had rather have its crown than authority. For behold even here (saith St. Paul<sup>o</sup>) a crown of righteousness, which God the righteous judge shall give me at that day, and not to me only, but to all them that love his appearing. A crown not of any corruptible or fading substance, such as the leafy crowns of the Olympick games, but of an incorruptible<sup>p</sup> one, and such as palleth not away, a crown of a far more<sup>p</sup> exceeding and eternal weight of glory, lastly a crown which is studded not with diamonds, or other such shining pebles, but with those more sparkling stones of heaven the stars. Next to the similitude of a *Kingdom* consider we that of a *feast*, under which resemblance the joys of heaven are also set forth. A resemblance, which is fitted to grosser minds shall I say or rather bodies, and may perhaps catch those to whom a Kingdom is no bait. Now what is there wanting in this feast which even an *Epicurean* palate would desire, or where may he either more largely or more deliciously fare? For beside that it is represented as a *marriage-supper*<sup>q</sup>, such as are wont to be the most splendidly and plentifully furnished; how are we told that *his oxen and fatlings*<sup>r</sup> are killed for it, that we shall *drink new wine*<sup>r</sup> with him at it, that we shall be allowed to *eat*<sup>r</sup> of the tree of life which bears twelve<sup>n</sup> manner of fruits, that we shall taste of that bread of Angels the hidden<sup>x</sup> Manna; lastly that we shall be carried where there are not only overflowing cups, but *rivers of pleasure*<sup>y</sup>, an abundance and a constant succession of them, such as a greater Army than that of *Xerxes*, even all the heavenly host, shall never exhaust, for they are rivers of pleasures for evermore? All which expressions shew plainly, that as there shall want nothing of glory and majesty, so neither any thing which may administer to our satisfaction and delight. Lastly (for these resemblances do rather adumbrate to us that

<sup>1</sup> Mat. 25. 34.

<sup>n</sup> Rev. 5. 10.

<sup>n</sup> 1 Cor. 6. 3.

<sup>o</sup> 2 Tim. 4. 8.

<sup>p</sup> 1 Cor. 9. 25.

<sup>q</sup> Mat. 22. 2. &c.

Rev. 19. 9.

<sup>r</sup> Mat. 22. 4.

<sup>r</sup> Mat. 26. 29.

<sup>r</sup> Rev. 2. 7.

<sup>n</sup> — 22. 2.

<sup>x</sup> — 2. 17.

<sup>y</sup> Psa. 16. 11.

— 36. 8.



everlasting life, than give us any clear description of it) what a tempting prospect doth St. John give the eye in his description of the *new Jerusalem*, the place where this everlasting life is to be led? Witness his assuring us that the *foundations of the walls thereof are garnished with all manner<sup>a</sup> of precious stones*, that the *twelve gates thereof are so many<sup>a</sup> great pearls*, that the *streets<sup>b</sup> of that City are pav'd with gold*, that *that gold is pure<sup>c</sup> as the transparent glass*, that all this glory is perpetually shone upon, not by so pale a light as that of the *Sun* or *Moon<sup>d</sup>*, but that more glorious one of *God* and of his *Son*. A strain equal to which no *Romance* hath ever yet dar'd, as if it exceeded not only truth, but the power of fiction. And though it be true, neither do I intend them as any other, these and other such like expressions are rather *resemblances* than *rigid characters* of the happiness and joy of the life to come, yet, as I said before in my discourse of those things by which the torments of the damned are represented, if there be but truth in them as *resemblances*, they cannot but import the happiness that is couch'd under them to be proportionably great and glorious, and such as shall satiate all our then remaining appetites and desires.

An account being thus given of those several resemblances whereby the Scripture endeavours to shadow forth that happiness which everlasting life contains, enquire we, so far as the Scripture will enable us, what the particulars thereof are, and first as to our outer man or body. This only would be premis'd, that the pleasures which shall be afforded it, are not such gross and carnal ones, as the resemblances before made use seem at first sight to insinuate to us. For beside that we are told<sup>e</sup> that *flesh and blood shall not inherit the kingdom of God*, and consequently the pleasures which shall be afforded must be concluded to be of another nature, according to that of *Homer*,

— ἢ σίτον ἢ οἶνον ἢ κρέας ἀδεσπα ὄντων,

τῶν τε ἀνείμωνος οἶσι, καὶ ἀδάνατοι καλέονται.

*They eat no meat, nor drink any wine, therefore they are without blood and are call'd immortal*; Besides this I say, our Saviour hath expressly remov'd all those pleasures which minister to the lower appetites. For in

the resurrection, saith he<sup>f</sup>, *they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the Angels of God in heaven*. As they are call'd to another kind of life, so they have pleasures suited to it, even such pleasures as are of a more refined nature, and more allied to those of which the Angels partake. Only lest, as it sometimes happens, what is represented as so refin'd should by the misconstruction of sensual men be interpreted

as none at all; St. Paul<sup>g</sup> hath taken care to assure us *first*, that whereas the body is now sown in *weakness and dishonour*, yea is encompassed with it even whilst it lives and flourisheth, it shall then be raised in *power and glory*, it shall be replenished with strength and majesty. No scar, save what we receiv'd for the testimony of Jesus, shall appear upon the face, nor that neither save with a singular light and beauty. No mist nor blemish shall be found upon the eye, there shall be no want of any of the integral parts of the body, no deformity or distortion upon those it hath. He, by whose power we rise, *shall change our vile body<sup>h</sup>, that it may be like unto his own glorious body according to the mighty working whereby he is able to subdue all things to himself*. Again, whereas

<sup>a</sup> Rev. 21. 19.

<sup>a</sup> ——— 21.

<sup>b</sup> ——— 1b.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid.

<sup>d</sup> Rev. 21. 23.

<sup>e</sup> 1 Cor. 15. 50.

<sup>f</sup> Mat. 22. 30.

<sup>g</sup> 1 Cor. 15. 43.

<sup>h</sup> Phil. 3. 21.

whereas this body is a *natural* and *earthly* one; whereas it bears the image of that *Adam* who was taken out of the dust, the same *St. Paul* tells us that it shall be raised a *spiritual* and *heavenly* one; it shall bear the image of him who was the *Lord from heaven*. That resurrection, which shall raise the body, at the same time burying in a manner its *corruptibility*, and committing that *earth to earth*. By which means, what was before but a prison to the Soul, shall then be made a fit companion for it, yea be fitted to enjoy that more divine as well as glorious spirit, into whose presence it shall be then admitted. Lastly, whereas the body even, in its best estate, is a *corruptible* and *fading* one, and shall one day fall under the dominion of corruption, it shall then put on *immortality* and *incorruption*, it shall mock at death and those miseries which are the harbingers of it; Enjoying the same vigour and beauty after it hath pass'd many millions of years, as it did at its first entrance on that state, and so on to eternal ages.

Such is the happiness which shall then accrue to that worse part of us our bodies, but no way inferior, yea infinitely superior to it shall be the happiness of our Souls. As will appear if we consider first that perfection of *knowledge* which they shall then attain, and then which there can hardly be any thing more dear to exalted ones. For though, as *St. Paul* speaks, we now see through a glass darkly, yet then face to face, though we now know in part only, yet then shall we know even as also we are known. Neither is this to be understood only of finite beings, which yet in this state of imperfection we labour to comprehend; our knowledge shall then extend to that being of beings *God*; and see even him also as he is; that is to say, so far as our finite nature is capable of it, as the disproportion between him and us will suffer. We shall not then, as we do now, see his love through the glass of tribulations, a glass which vitiates and obscures those species that are transmitted through it; nor look upon his wisdom through many cross providences, which is a glass that either inverts or distorts all those rays that pass through it; Lastly, we shall not see his power, as we do now, through the scant measure of our own, or (which comes not much short of it) of our weak and fallible understandings. When the time of our seeing God face to face shall come, his love shall shine forth to us in nothing but suitable expressions, his wisdom in clear and direct emanations. We shall see his power in the undoubted effects of it, and in the infinity of that nature which we are admitted to contemplate. There shall be nothing either of imperfection or obscurity even upon this knowledge of ours, and we shall not only behold God face to face, but have a full prospect of it. And though *Piety* and *Virtue* be things which are not so generally acceptable, because they do but ill agree with those corrupt inclinations we have contracted; Yet as there are Souls to whom even those are acceptable, and would be much more so if they had that clear knowledge of things to which they shall be afterwards advanced, so I cannot therefore but represent it as a farther addition to that happiness which everlasting life bringeth, that there shall be a perfection in them also. For neither first can that perfection be denied to the spirits of just men presently after their separation from their bodies, and how much less then, when they are exalted to this more blessed estate? Because the *Author of the Hebrews* assures us that those spirits are made perfect, which if it be not to be understood especially



cially of a perfection of holiness, yet doth suppose it at least, because a perfection of glory is but the reward of it. The same is no less evident from our then beholding of God's face, and that likeness which shall follow upon it. For if beholding God in a glass only we are *changed into the same image*, how much more when we shall behold him face to face, when we shall *know even as also we are known*? Here therefore let us a while contemplate this our expected happiness, and ruminate upon that felicity which we shall then enjoy. If we have within us a combat between flesh and spirit, if the law of that do sometime bear sway over the law of our better part our mind; that empire shall then not only be check'd but extinguish'd by the destruction of that part which wars against us: Our bodies, as was before observ'd, then losing all their carnal affections, and chang'd from *animal and earthly* into *spiritual and heavenly*. Again if we are now assaulted by *spiritual wickednesses in high places*, by such as take up their habitation in our more noble part our Soul; we shall then, because *our spirits shall be made perfect*, be freed from the attack of them also, and have our Souls no less subdued unto God than our bodies. If we were before proud and haughty, we shall then be humble and submissive, if haters of God in any measure, passionate lovers of him. We shall entertain nothing in our thoughts which may be displeasing to him, we shall resolve on nothing which is not exactly conformable to his will. We shall admire and adore his wisdom as well as know it, we shall reverence his power as well as acknowledge it. What he loves shall be the matter of ours, what he rejoiceth in shall be the ground of our exultation. We shall readily and cheerfully follow the conduct of his operations and commands, and move as that our loadstone draws. Lastly, as the Soul of man shall then be filled with knowledge and piety, and so far forth therefore perfected in that which may make it happy, so it is not difficult to collect from those and other its acquisitions, that it shall then be fill'd with a proportionable joy. Joy at the pardon of the persons sins which shall then be complete, at the acceptation of the whole man which shall then be fully declar'd; joy at its own stupendous acquisitions of wisdom and knowledge, at the conformity of its will to reason and to its God: And all this heap'd up by the consideration of that and its own *eternity*, and that as it is now happy, so it shall ever be, the last thing propos'd to be entreated of.

And here omitting, because generally known, the several expressions whereby this eternal life is set forth, such as that of a *continuing City*, and which *hath foundations*, an *inheritance incorruptible* and *that fadeth not away*, it shall suffice me barely to admonish men of the immortality and incorruptibility of the glorified body, and the no reason there appears why we should fix any limits to the happiness either of that or of the Soul. For if even that worse part of us our bodies shall be thus everlasting, how much more our Souls, which as they are compos'd of better principles, so are *they* which must give life unto the other. And though some pretence may be made why we should set bounds to the damned's torments, because of the seeming disproportion between a finite sin and a never ending punishment; yet can no such pretence be made for setting bounds to their happiness who enter into this state of bliss. For though *our light afflictions*, and all our piety to boot, *be not worthy to be compar'd to that glory which shall be reveal'd*, and much

<sup>1</sup> Heb. 13. 14.

<sup>2</sup> — 11. 10.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Pet. 1. 4.



much less to an *eternal weight* of it, yet nothing hinders but God, who is rich in mercy, may bestow that blessing on us, and crown this moment with eternity: This being an act not of justice but of mercy, which knows no other bounds than the will of him that shews it. Forasmuch therefore as God hath frequently declar'd this happy life to be everlasting, even as to our worser part our bodies; forasmuch as there appears not any the least pretence in reason why we should set bounds to it; it remains that we believe it to be no less in truth than in name *everlasting*, and that as such we quietly wait for it. This only would be added, if it were but to dispose men to the practice of those most holy laws <sup>or Decalogue or</sup> which the *Catechism* comes next of all to entreat of, that the *righteous* <sup>The Command-</sup> and *he alone* shall enter into everlasting life, he whose conversation is <sup>ments.</sup> already in that place, where everlasting life and we our selves shall be bestow'd. <sup>Mat. 25. 46.</sup>

## FINIS.

### ERRATA

#### Of the Introduction.

Page 9. Line 17. put the Parenthesis after *upon*. p. 12. l. 35. after *be* add *as*. p. 15. l. 7. r. *owing*.

#### Of the Explication.

##### In the Title over the Pages.

Page 79. for *The Father* r. *Almighty*.

##### In the Text.

Page 22. lin. 40. for *thing* read *nothing*. ib. l. 46. Saviour's. p. 24. l. 48. for *not* r. *only*. p. 29. l. 27. r. *Praxas*. p. 53. l. 22. religion's. p. 65. l. 28. for *his being*, a fountain r. *his being a fountain*. p. 66. l. 44. *three*. p. 68. l. 41. *their*. p. 84. l. 36. *besides that that*. p. 97. l. 46. for *whom* r. *when*. p. 106. l. 24. for *as* r. *is*. p. 107. l. 8. Paraphrast. p. 109. l. 18. dele *it*. p. 115. l. 6. r. *proscribed*. p. 116. l. ult. for *so* r. *to*. p. 120. l. 11. *Moses*. ib. l. 29. *Only*. ib. l. 47. *memoires*. p. 129. l. 36. *I say*. p. 130. l. 40. *inglorious*. p. 149. l. 42. for *de* r. *be*. ib. l. penult. *had a withered hand*. p. 169. l. 27. for *possible* r. *passible*. p. 174. l. 8. for *may* r. *might*. p. 180. l. antep. after *was* add *so*. p. 186. l. 40. *whereof*. p. 191. l. 42. for *and* to r. *and so*. p. 205. l. 20. for *men* r. *man*. ib. l. antep. for *saying* r. *saving*. p. 207. l. 11. dele *had*. p. 209. l. 2. after *being* add *not*. p. 210. l. 3. after *farther* add *reason*. p. 211. l. 3. after *away* add *as*. p. 225. l. 21. for *Son* r. *Sun*. p. 229. l. 30. after *himself* add *so*. p. 245. l. 34. after *understanding* add *it*. p. 245. l. 34. after *in* add *the*. p. 264. l. 17. after *us* add *so*. p. 273. l. 17. after *so* dele *to*. p. 275. l. 13. r. *startled*. p. 283. l. 20. for *matter* r. *master*. p. 284. l. 11. for *For* r. *Far*. p. 289. l. antep. *advertent*. p. 291. l. 40. *Nature*. p. 293. l. antep. after *than* add *that*. p. 295. l. 5. r. of *those things that are*. p. 299. l. 39. for *avoid* r. *void*. p. 300. l. 32. for *Christ* r. *Church*. p. 302. l. antep. *edifying thereof*; p. 303. l. 49. *detested*. p. 309. l. 23. no. p. 318. l. 47. *Societie*. p. 322. l. 48. after *part of* add *the*. p. 343. l. 35. for *what* r. *which*. ib. 37. for *which* r. *what*.

##### In the Margent.

Page 74. r. *καρτογράφος*. p. 111. l. 7. *Mal.* 2. 7. p. 117. l. 4. &c. r. *Explicat. of the word dead*. p. 121. l. 3. r. *Num.* 12. 6. p. 161. l. 1. *Heb.* 7. 26. p. 162. l. 3. r. *Deut.* 18. &c. p. 171. l. ult. *Luc.* 22. 44. p. 179. l. 1. *Psa.* 22. &c. p. 202. l. 2. *Eph.* 4. 7. p. 210. l. 9. r. 95. p. 249. l. 5. *Rom.* 11. 2. p. 270. l. 8. for 2 *Cor.* 5. 10. r. 2 *Tim.* 4. 1. p. 273. l. 6. *Matt.* 13. 30. &c. p. 290. l. ult. *Canabrig.* p. 315. l. 17. r. *quum*.